



**AN INTRODUCTION
TO
BRHADĀRANYAKA BHĀṢYA**

by
ŚRĪ SVĀMĪ MAHEŚĀNANDA GIRI MAHĀRĀJA
Mahāmaṇḍaleśvara
Śrī Dakṣiṇāmūrtimatha

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--------------------------------------|----|
| The Introduction | 1 |
| Analysis of contents | 3 |
| [CHAPTER I] | |
| Aśvamedha Upāsanā | 4 |
| Good and evil | 6 |
| Meditation on Self alone | 10 |
| Man's entitlement | 13 |
| I am Brahman | 14 |
| Obstruction to results | 15 |
| Creation of Caste | 17 |
| Food | 19 |
| [CHAPTER II] | |
| Ajātaśatru Vidyā | 20 |
| Form and formless | 24 |
| Maitreyī Brāhmaṇa | 25 |
| Madhu Brāhmaṇa | 29 |
| [CHAPTER III] | |
| Organs and Objects | 32 |
| Bhujyu Brāhmaṇa | 33 |
| Uṣasta Brāhmaṇa | 34 |
| Kahole Brāhmaṇa | 35 |
| Gārgī Brāhmaṇa | 36 |
| Uddālaka Brāhmaṇa | 37 |
| The attributeless Brahman | 38 |
| Śākalya Brāhmaṇa | 42 |
| Henotheism—a misnomer | 44 |
| [CHAPTER IV] | |
| The three states | 51 |
| About sin | 53 |
| On grace | 55 |
| World-affirmation and world-negation | 57 |
| Measures of Bliss | 58 |
| Transmigration | 59 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Sannyāsa | 62 |
| Extroversion and introversion | 67 |
| [CHAPTER V] | |
| ‘Pūrṇamadah’ etc. | 69 |
| Meditation on space | 70 |
| Control, charity and compassion | 71 |
| Austerity, Gāyatri and the last prayer | 72 |
| [CHAPTER VI] | |
| Why such a finale ? | 75 |
| Supramacy of vitality | 76 |
| Pentad fire | 78 |
| Rituals | 80 |
| Birth Ceremony | 85 |
| Conclusion | 87 |



INTRODUCTION

The Upaniṣads generally form the last portions of the Veda and are positively the culmination of its philosophy. They are India's greatest contribution to the world of theology and theosophy. Forming the highest strata to which the human spirit can soar, they have dominated religion, philosophy and life in all variety representing the Indian ethos. There has been no development, either as a religious sect or a philosophical school, in Hinduism that has not based or claimed to have based itself upon the fundamentals of the Upaniṣads, so much so, that heretic sects like Buddhism, Jainism, and Sikhism also claim them as their sources. The atheistic philosophies of the Cārvakas etc. find their doubts anticipated in these Vedāntas. It is interesting to note that the Communist Party has claimed not only the Upaniṣads, but also Śaṅkara's ideas as the early formation of their philosophy. Thus certitudes as well as hesitations, knowledge as well as nihilism and results as well as misgivings have been anticipated in them. The world of philosophies and religions has been represented in them in one essential or the other. In India, of course, for ages, men have formulated their views relying on the Upaniṣads to solve the chief problems of life and existence. Prof. Winternitz frankly declares, 'For the historian, who pursues the history of human thoughts, the Upaniṣads have yet a far greater significance. From the mystical doctrines of the Upaniṣads, one current of thought may be traced to the mysticism of Persian Sufism, to the mystic, theosophical logos, doctrine of the neo-platonics and the Alexandrian Christian mystics, Eckhart and Tauler, and finally to the philosophy of the great German Mystic of the nineteenth century, Schopenhauer.' (A History of Indian Literature, Vol. I, pg. 266) Schopenhauer himself claims, 'From every sentence (of the Upaniṣads), deep original and sublime thoughts arise, and the whole is pervaded by a high and holy and earnest spirit. In the whole world there is no study..... so beneficial and so elevating as that of the Upaniṣads. They are products of the highest wisdom. They are sooner or later to become the faith of the peoples.' The Upaniṣads are inheritance bestowed on humanity rather upon than any national, racial or religious group. They have appealed to different people in different ages for different reasons. Professor Radhakrishnan concludes : They are said to provide us with a complete chart of the Unseen Reality; to give us the most immediate, intimate and convincing light on the secret of human existence; to formulate, in Deussen's words, "philosophical conceptions unregulated anywhere else in the world." W. B. Yeats, in his preface to the Ten Principal Upaniṣads accepts that they tackle every fundamental problem of philosophy. R. Golden Milburn, in his Christian Vedānta writes, "Christianity in India needs the Vedānta. We missionaries have not realized this with half the clearness that we should. We cannot move freely and joyfully in our own religion because we have not sufficient terms and modes of expression wherewith to express the more immanent aspects of Christianity." It is a historical fact that a pope of the twentieth century has allowed the Upaniṣads to be read in the Church as a substitute for the Old Testament. It is clear the Upaniṣads are 'World Scriptures', not belonging only to India, much less, only to Hinduism.

THE TERM AND ITS MEANING

The term Upaniṣad is derived from the root ṣadṣ, and means the knowledge of Brahman that destroys the ignorance about God and his relation to Man, on understanding the true implication of the texts and analysing them in a rational manner. It is also hinted that this knowledge can primarily be acquired by being in close proximity to a person of Reali-

zation who understands the texts poetically and not just linguistically. Hinduism is the religion of poets. Perhaps no other religion calls God or Godmen by the epithet 'kavi' meaning a poet. Semitic religions are positively prophetic religions. To a Hindu mind a prophet may be a yogī or a siddha, but not necessarily a 'sthita-prjña' or a 'jīvanmukta'. The true meaning of these Divine utterances, which no linguistic analysis can ever yield, can only be grasped by a Guru's guidance. Śaṅkara points out that Vedānta is a science of experience and not logical analysis : 'Ekam Vedāntavijñānam Svānubhūtya Virajate'. This is the implication when it is said that the Vedas are to be heard (śruti) and not read. Hence the third suggested meaning of the term is a mystical knowledge, 'rahasyam or guhyam.' When Jaratkarva Ārtabhaga asked Yājñavalkya the 'secrets', the sage took him to a lonely place and explained, saying, 'let us two alone know it'. It is pointed out that mere discussing or 'jalpa' cannot lead to the final truth. Śaṅkara propounds that where many are present, the Truth evades. This assertion is interesting from the pen of Śaṅkara who led many philosophical battles (Śāstrārtha) in the realm of philosophy and attained victory in each one of them. As a matter of history, we all know that it was his intellectual and logical criticism that destroyed Buddhism in the land of its birth without spilling a drop of blood. Looking at the wars, inquisitions and fundamentalism of the semitic religions, one cannot but feel an immense pride in the greatness of all Indian religions which depend upon ethical, poetic and intellectual instruments regarding conversion and not socio-political, economic or military means employed by Judaism Christianity and Mohammanism.

The Upaniṣads, or the works that go by the name, number presently to over two hundred and fifty, which shows that most sectarians want to get the support of the name for their imagined theories. In fact, the Upaniṣads referred to in the 'Brahma-sūtras' and its Bhāṣhya, are only eighteen, out of which only ten have been commented upon by Śaṅkara. Śvetāśvatara, Mahopaniṣad, Kaushītaki, Jābala, Kaivalya, Paramahansa, Maitrāyaṇī and Paingala are the remaining ones.

THE PRESENT TITLE

Amongst all the Upaniṣads, Bṛhadāraṇyaka is the most voluminous and has the greatest depth. It belongs to Yajurveda, forming the last part of its Brāhmaṇa, the Śatapatha. The whole work can be looked upon as consisting of three divisions : the Madhukāṇḍa, expounding the philosophy of religion as an identification of the soul and god; the Yājñavalkya or muni-kāṇḍa, giving the logical approach; the Khila-kāṇḍa supporting the vision with certain upāsanās. The first two 'kāṇḍas' complete the basic sādhanā to attain direct experience of god. Thus, śravaṇa, manana and nididhyāsana are all treated in a wholesome and systematic manner.

Fortunately for us, this Upaniṣad has been commented upon by Śrī Sureśvara Āchārya so exhaustively that a study of his Vārtika along with its gloss by Ānandagiri is said to leave nothing unknown about the true wisdom : 'Vartikānta Brahma-vidyā'. In volume, it is half the size of the Vālmīki Rāmāyana, consisting of twelve thousand verses. The Institute is bringing out the complete annotated work in two volumes. The Vārtika has been abridged by Vidyāraṇya in his Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Vārtika-Sāra, further commented upon by Maheśvarānanda late in the eighteenth century. Some of the greatest philosophers have dived deep into the Bṛhadāraṇyaka literature and brought out precious jewels of wisdom from its bed. The present volume contains the text of the Upaniṣad, Āchārya Śaṅkara's Bhāṣhya and Ānandagiri's Nyāya-Nirṇaya. Vidyā-Araṇya's comments on the Mādhyandina recension have also been appended, being published, as far as we know, for the first time. It is a known fact that the

white Yajurveda has two available recensions: the Kāṇva and the Mādhyandina. Though Śaṅkar has followed the former in both, the Īś and the Bṛhadāraṇyaka, yet there are important variants and additions in the latter recension, analysed by Sureshvar. Vidyāraṇya's Dipikā coming from the pen of one who has commented upon the whole Veda will help to grasp the spirit of the śruti better. Giri makes a specific mention of the fact that he has relied on the Vārtika in annotating the Bhāṣya.

ANALYSIS OF CONTENTS

The Bhāṣya begins with an invocation to all great teachers of Vedānta, from Brahmā to one's own guru. According to Giri, following of course the commentator himself, Brahmā is either the Deity or the scriptures. Being the source of all deities and wisdom, they are the progenitors of the tradition. Similarly, Hiraṇyagarbha being the first preceptor and creator of all deities, is the source of traditional knowledge as well as deities. By praying to him, we pray to all the gods. At the very outset Śaṅkar has preferred monotheism to polytheism. But Advaita is not anti-polytheistic: it absorbs the many gods into the concept of one Deity. Vedānta is not iconoclastic but is definitely oriented towards a monotheistic formless Deity. Since the 'līṅga' of Śiva is formless, it is the best representation of the Great God. Similarly is om (ॐ) the representation of the scriptures. Identifying 'om' and the 'līṅga' makes Giri's interpretation clearer.

Śaṅkara introduces the Upaniṣad with pointing out that its purpose is to initiate an aspirant into the wisdom of his oneness with Śiva, which alone is capable of completely destroying the miseries of the world. Giri points out that only wild-men (नरपशु), because of their wild passions, are fit to observe the rules of Karmakāṇḍa leading to heaven or the pinnacle of sensual enjoyment. But those who are devoted to the worship of Śiva out of love and thus dedicate all their actions to him, develop an aversion to sensuousness and in them the passions are sublimated, making their minds crystal clear in which the great wisdom dawns. These are the fit recipients of this knowledge. Wisdom must lead to salvation. Since no amount of learning can ever lead to salvation without dispassions, so the Upaniṣads become worthless to those who are full of desires. But even they benefit by them by inculcating the gem of discrimination between the eternal and ephemeral.

It is declared in the Bhāṣya that the Veda in its totality is nothing but a means of knowing that which gives joy or removes misery. By nature one likes to have joy and removal of misery. But neither sense-knowledge, nor reasoning based on it, is able to free us from misery in its totality, nor able to give joy which is boundless. Hence are the Vedas bestowed upon humanity by God Himself to know the means. Really speaking, God is knowledge, hence the Veda is his own word transformation. Thus Śiva, his knowledge in the form of the Veda and the knower of Śiva are identical. This identity is Advaita. Giri makes the matter transparent by pointing out that Veda is experience (वेदनं वेदोऽनुभवः, pg. 3) and that consciousness itself is the true meaning of the Veda (वेदपदवेदनीयः चिदेकरसः प्रत्यग्भातुः). Since this knowledge is reflected in only a pure mind and since there is no way to attain this purity but by following the ethical and moral life, the Veda has to describe these alongwith the wisdom. But some people get deluded by misconstruing the Vaidika knowledge into a series of actions because of the detailed treatment of action, physical and mental, in the Veda. One is reminded of the Gītā in this context. Arjuna had already decided to fight and hence had entered the battle-field. But he wanted to know the truth, for action was ordained by scriptures as much as moral and ethical doctrine of non-violence, non-possessiveness etc. Which of the two was the real import and which only a concession. Whenever there is a conflict of values one is bound to feel that

the basis of values must be realised to solve the problem. Kṛṣṇa pointed out that neither action nor non-action was the aim of the scriptures. God alone as infinite consciousness was the aim of the scriptures. Action and non-action, both belonged to the realms of ignorance. Knowing oneself to be different from all the products of ignorance and identity with Śiva and to basking in its sunshine is the ultimate goal. Let the current of the Divine will act or non-act as it pleases in the present mind-body complex is the basis of all values. In spite of this being obvious from time immemorial, some scholars have taken the Gītā as a book of action. Similarly, the Veda also has been taken as a book of action rather than a book of wisdom by most people. The true import of the Veda has been made clear in Giri's thorough analysis and some important light thrown by Subrahmaṇya Śāstri's annotations. The Vārtika in this section has dealt with the topic of action, according to the Prabhākara school of thought, so exhaustively that it is considered a guide to that school, even better than Bṛhatī, Prabhākara's magnum opus. Giri has tried to condense the Vārtika in his annotation. Śaṅkara has pointed out that the continual existence of the soul before birth and after death is the foundation on which the whole edifice of the philosophies of Prabhākara and Kumārila stand. The existence or otherwise of the soul cannot be maintained depending on direct perception, for it is not an object of direct perception, else the Buddhists and Cārvākas would not have rejected it outright. Hence, even prior to daily and incidental liturgy, one must think out the nature of the soul. Surprisingly, if one does that with boldness, one has no alternative to the acceptance of an all-pervasive single consciousness manifesting itself in many different ways. The Bhāṣya boldly asserts that transmigration can never be based upon perception or inference (जन्मान्तरसम्बन्धस्याग्रहणात्), The fault in the inference about the existence of the soul, according to the Gautama school of thought, has been brilliantly exposed by Giri. The Gautama school maintains that freedom, effort etc. are qualities and thereby need a material substance to exist in. No such substance is palpable, so it has to be inferred, and that is the soul. But Vedānta points out that as these qualities are always found along with the mind, a material substance, it is illogical to infer another material substance for their inherence. The existence of the soul however depends upon the Vaidika declarations to that effect. Since it is the Veda alone that gives insight on Ātman, one must depend upon its authority to determine the real nature of the soul.

Those wanting pleasure and avoidance of pain at the level of the body-mind complex, are taught by the Veda to perform the particular karma that might satisfy their want. The almost uncontrollable impulse of desire makes one indulge in unethical and prohibited acts also. Those who are advanced in moral life get inclination towards some form of Śiva, perform their duties while developing love towards Him, while those who are addicted only to desires worship different deities, without any love. Thus monotheism implies a higher state of mind than does polytheism. Quoting Manu, Giri asserts that one who performs his duty without any excessive attachment to desires and with the knowledge that he is merely fulfilling God's will, is a real renunciate (निष्कामं ज्ञानपूर्वं नु निवृत्तमभिधीयते). Gītā has developed the idea in detail. This slow development is not enough to satisfy a real seeker of Truth. The one who wants the veil of ignorance removed from the Real, gets rid of even the remnants of desires as the master urge to see Śiva face to face is most intense in him. He alone is the most fit recipient of the Real Truth and the Upaniṣad is addressed mainly to such a one.

THE FIRST UPĀSANĀ

The Āśvamedha is the ultimate karma to attain both, individual and cosmic fulness. To demonstrate that even that sacrifice is insufficient to deliver liberation, viz. direct vision

of the Divine, the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad starts with a meditation of the Aśvamedha, which produces the same fruit as the complicated ritual. As is the case elsewhere in the Upaniṣads, meditation alone is the substitute for the karma for introverts. This Meditation is grand cosmic idolization. The different organs of a horse are identified with natural time, space, vegetation etc. Śaṅkara points out, that as to view an idol of Viṣṇu is to make the idol into Viṣṇu, so to view the horse as time, space and divinities, is to convert it into Prajāpati. According to Giri, even a sacrificer can meditate upon the sacrificial horse to get better results. Whoever is unable to perform the actual sacrifice should think of his own body etc. as the horse and identify time etc. with his own organs, making his own body the horse and identifying his own self as Prajāpati, and reap the highest fruit. Many later meditations are based on this foundation. The body should be identified with the Divine body, the mind with the Divine mind and the ego with the Deity's ego.

To emphasise the importance of the horse as a symbol, the Upaniṣad traces its origin. Since the horse is identified with the cosmos, cosmic evolution is introduced. Śaṅkara utilises the opportunity to discuss the problem of causality. It is said in the Upaniṣad that in the beginning there was nothing, Death covered everything, which seems like saying that out of nothing, something comes out. But this is most unreasonable and unpragmatic, for all our actions, theories, knowledge etc. depend upon the commitment to causality. It, however, suits the nihilist to deny positive causality for whom everything comes out of nothing : a thing is destroyed, out of the absence of which, another originates. That the Upaniṣad does not intend to preach nihilism is brought out by Śaṅkara who points out that the clause—Death covered everything—asserts that there was *Death* which covered and *something* which was covered by it. Hence total absence cannot be the purport of the Upaniṣad. Therefore the meaning is : there was the cause that covered and the effect that was covered. The import is that of positivism instead of nihilism: both the cause and the effect were existent before the manifestation of the effect. The Nasadiya sūkta of the Ṛgveda also emphasises the very same idea when it says : darkness covered the darkness. As for the nihilist's logical view that it is only out of the destruction of a jar that a pitcher comes into being, the great dialectician Śaṅkara points out that out of the clay that resulted from the destruction of the form of the pot does the pitcher come into being and not out of the destruction. The depth of the analysis is further brought out by the editor. Of course, a comparative study of this section with the Vārtika would yield a mine of information. Śaṅkara informs that no particular form is the cause of any particular form. It is rather the cause that pervades all the effects. To the assertion that it is similarity that leads to the illusion of a continuous cause, the Master declares that direct perception of the elements of the cause and the effect cannot be contradicted by assumptions based on pseudo-logic. It is Śaṅkara's conviction that experience is the bed rock on which the edifice of any philosophy is to be based and not *vice versa*, viz. trying to fit experience in the handcuffs of assumed theories cooked up by one-self. Continuity, self evident by experience of recognition, cannot be contradicted by a logical assertion alone. For example, to say that fire, being a substance, is cold, like ice a cold substance, is a logical fallacy because fire is perceived as hot. No logic can contradict a fact of experience, for it depends on induction and deduction which are necessarily based on experience. Logic is but an instrument to explain experience. The nihilist's position is broken down here even more completely than in the Sūtra-Bhāṣya.

Death, according to Śaṅkara, is in fact the conditioned state of Brahman, for it is hunger that causes death of other creatures : when hungry, one kills another. No social organisation is strong where basic hunger is prevalent, is a fundamental conception of society

which is brought out by the Upaniṣad and its Bhāṣya. To satisfy hunger, an individual forgets all social, moral and spiritual laws and is possessed to fulfil his need, no matter that he harms his own society in the process. One is reminded of the famous Ṛgveda verse that possession by some leads the masses to bring death to those few. Śaṅkara points out that hunger is a quality residing in the intellect associated with consciousness. The intellect meant here is the cosmic one, that of Hiraṇyagarbha. Thus the meaning of the Aupaniṣada position is : Hiraṇyagarbha, the first cause, was covering the entire existence to be manifested.

The text goes on to describe creation and associated meditations. The mind, body, speech etc. were created. Speech is the Veda. Paying attention to the order of creation mentioned, is the association of the speech and mind. Eventually the horse was created, which is nothing but Prajāpati manifesting himself as the one fit to be sacrificed. A realiser of this fact becomes one with Him. This reminds one of the story of the lamb being sacrificed as Christ. The son of God, who is himself God, is sacrificed because he becomes the son of man. The generalized import of the śruti is that all that comes into existence out of Existence must be sacrificed to attain the Reality or the all-consuming Śiva. Even death cannot overtake such a one, for it becomes his own self. After crucifixion, Jesus becomes identical with God and death touches him no more. It is this projection of reality expressed in a mythological version in the theological concept of crucifixion. "I am Death, the horse sacrifice. The Deity is only one and that is me. The Deity is attainable through the horse and the fire"; this is the realization that frees one from the clutches of death. Śaṅkara by the way explains that the sun or fire is called Arka because it sprung up while Prajāpati was worshipping. Since worship is the cause of happiness and is associated with water the name Arka is based on quality. Similarly is Aditi also Prajāpati because she eats everything. Any one meditating thus, identifying himself with Aditi, becomes an enjoyer of all that is perceived. This only means that he becomes identified with Śiva, since no one can be physically an enjoyer of all. This portion is absent in the Mādhyandina Upaniṣad, though it occurs elsewhere in that recension.

GOOD AND EVIL

The earlier section dealt with the meditation associated with action, leading to supreme knowledge by the identification of the aspirant with Śiva. The present section points out the method to get rid of attachments and aversions, obstacles to this identity, by the real knowledge of Prāṇa through Udgātha meditation. The object however is the same.

Gods and demons, children of the present Prajāpati, are younger or smaller in number and elder or greater in number respectively. According to Śaṅkarachārya, spiritually guided thoughts and actions are, in fact, the gods meant here and the thoughts and actions naturally guided by sense perception and inferences, leading to results seen here and now, are the real demons. It is obvious that demonic tendencies are natural and numerous, while divine tendencies are developed later with effort and are always limited. In all ages, demons surpass the divine. This concept is in opposition to the Paurāṇika view that time degenerates men and that the yugas are each worse than the previous ones. It is also at variance with the evolutionary concept that development increases with the progression of time. That the demons have always been numerous and the gods few, is a reality accepted by the Veda. Both try ever to surpass each other. According to Vidyāraṇya, sattva leading to śama, tranquility and peace, is implied by the term god, while tama leading to kama, passion, is the demon. The out-come of this ever existing war is directly perceivable by the increase of peace and passion alternately. The victory of divine tendencies takes one up to the status of Prajāpati while that of the de-

monic ones causes descent down till the state of vegetation. Humanity being the balance of both, it is when both of them are balanced that one achieves the human body, from where man has a chance to ascend or to descend. The term 'man' used by Śaṅkara shows that according to him all men are entitled to progress upwards from man or down-wards, from man, as they choose. Scriptural tendencies can only be developed after scriptural knowledge, which means that all men are entitled to study the scriptures meant for their growth. Man is in a very special position being able to direct his life. All other creatures can only reap their fruits, but man can sow as well as reap. Just as seeds can be sown or eaten, but are primarily meant for sowing, so is the human life meant as an instrument to achieve one's goals. Thus is man independent of nature which though limiting him, does not remove his independence. Schopenhauer remarks, 'Virtue and holiness do not proceed from reflection, but from inner depths of will. A good action is accompanied by unspeakable satisfaction and a bad action by endless remorse.' (*The World as Will and Idea*, ed. 1818). The presumed mental or intellectual slavery in action is not true. Once the will is active, it finds its own rationalization. It is basically the will that we sow. The great sage of Vedānta illustrates in the *Yoga-Vāśiṣṭha* that though a daughter and a beloved are embraced physically in an identical manner, yet both embraces are entirely different due to attitudes inherent in them. The attitudes remaining in a person are sown and reaped. One who develops virtuous will in its infinite expanse, becomes the precursor of world generation. Vāśiṣṭha demonstrates the fact further by relating how due to the activity of his own seed a new world order came into being when he went to utter nothingness for a quiet spot for meditation. The incident made him realize that the power of the Prajāpati was basically the same.

The soul and its relation to actions can never be understood philosophically unless the power and form of will is properly understood. According to the Upaniṣads, the whole apparatus of perception is separate from the Ātman and is a manifestation of the physical. Since superimposition of the spirit and non-spirit on each other is the root cause of transmigration, it can easily be seen that will in its natural state is the cause of transmigration. It is a different matter that the will expressed itself as ignorance from the beginning of time (नैसर्गिक), and it is again the will to disassociate from the superimposition that the path of knowledge is opened (ज्ञानासा). Since the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* is going to assert, like all other Vedānta texts that will is the first cause of manifestation (अकामयत, ऐक्यत), its independence is axiomatic. It is an eternal absolutely inseparable determination of the Cosmic Soul, though once individualized it is bound to become limited to the extent of the limitation of the individual soul. Thus, will is at its lowest voltage in vegetation, while in *Hiraṇyagarbha*, at its highest expression, practically as powerful as the absolute free Will. Since man is the object of scriptural injunction (मनुष्याधिकारत्वाच्छास्त्रस्य), it is clear that he is free in action, else why should he also not be, like animals, irresponsible for his actions and the fruits that result from it. As all philosophy, religion and ethics deal with only human beings, the Upaniṣads assert their independence in action but since they are limited in their apparatus of perception and expression, they are limited as well. Knowledge is the limiting factor: we will that which we know is able to remove misery and bring a happy and relaxed state. Since we are identified with our body-mind complex we will for its comfort, least realizing that those very actions that ensue from this ignorance lead us to misery again. Here comes the significance of the scriptures which show us the way to get out of this ignorance. In following the scriptures, we are in fact freeing our will, though it looks contradictory that by giving up our will we shall regain it. Thus ethics in Vedānta is removal of ignorance that limits us to the body-mind complex and gaining knowledge of our real identity with Śiva whose will is absolutely free. In attaining libera-

tion we become absolutely free-willed, with no limitation whatsoever. In that state of infinite power, volition immediately fructifies, there being no intermediary moment between desire and its fulfilment wherefore it is equally called a desireless stage (सत्यकाम, अशक्तकाम, पूर्णकाम). Prior to this stage, will is objective and thus a desire. A person with desires is in the thralldom of prohibitions and injunctions. On willing prohibitions, one becomes an asura, and a devata when injunctions are willed.

The Upaniṣad asserts that the *elan vital* (प्राण) is without limitation of individuality, flowing directly according to Śiva's will. So does one become, on meditating upon it (*elan vital*), a natural flow, remaining established in the consciousness of the unattached undetermining observer. Thus the view of the Karmavādi that all the Vedas are meaningful in directing our actions, physical or psychological, stands refuted. Śaṅkara has of course dealt with the problem in a scholastic fashion. His deduction is that the Upaniṣad merely conveys the Truth as it is, not for changing anything physical or psychological. His conclusion however is that even the scriptures prescribing actions or meditations are also basically giving true information about the cause and effect, though the information is as true as the effect and not true without reference to ignorance. Thus, the Upaniṣad educates us about the really Real, while the rest of the Veda informs about the unreally real. It is also to be noted that unlike the Karmakāṇḍis, Śaṅkara regards the scriptures as informants (ज्ञापक) and not injunctive (कारक). Even daily duties are for the ignorant having likes and dislikes. For those who have understood the reality about Śiva only wisdom is laid down as a duty. Natural and instinctive actions like ingestion of food or avoidance of cold etc., need only the inherent ignorance, not scriptural injunctions and definite time etc. The implications of these topics as regards the Pūrva-mīmāṃsā are brought out in the footnotes. While most annotators try to build a bridge between Vaidika and the smārta sannyāsa and by implication restrict the spirit of sannyāsa, Śaṅkara has positively emphasised the Vaidika Paramahansa sannyāsa in this stage of the spiritual ladder (सर्वकर्मसंन्यास). Any rule or prohibition is bound to bring up the limitations of varṇa, āśrama etc. which are bound to contradict the real spirit of non-doer (अकर्ता) and non-enjoyer (अशोक्ता) aspect of ātman which, if he is to realise the absolute, the aspirant has to get rid of. While Śaṅkara is a revolutionary, the later writers, compromisers. Such a development is natural in any spiritual or religious movement. Once the movement is settled in a particular society, the norms of that society are bound to infiltrate into the spiritual order. This is true of even Buddha, Mahāvīra, Christ, Mohammad, Śaṅkara, Nānak and Rāmakṛṣṇa. But since Śaṅkara is clear in his enunciation of principles and is the *only* spiritual founder who has himself written down his concepts, he carries greater weight. In spite of more than a millennium, even today his order of Paramahansas stick more to the principle of sannyāsa than any order founded by any other religious leader. This is true even of Vaidika laities.

'From the unreal lead me to the real, from darkness to light, from death to immortality'. This is one of the most famous liturgies that this Upaniṣad has given. It is such an universal prayer that when the first Pope to visit India departed from here, he uttered it as his final message. As it is to be uttered without regular accent, it may be used by all. It must be recited for one's own sake, not by a priest for a fee. Śaṅkara informs that unreal are the natural acts and tendencies while real are the ethical ones. Similarly is ignorance death and knowledge immortality, for ignorance is the cause of death and knowledge that of immortality.

Till the fourth section (Brāhmaṇa) of the first chapter, actions and meditations conducive to the realization of Śiva are given. In the fifth section, pure knowledge and its particulars are detailed. The learned editor has pointed out that the sophia here is not

identical with that of a similar passage in the Chāndogya Upaniṣad, on the basis of the Brahma Sūtra 3. 3. 3. He has also informed that in the context, Sureśvara takes the term Atman to mean pure Śiva, while Śaṅkara takes it as the oversoul (विराट्). Following the Vārtika, Rāmānuja has also taken the term to mean Narayana, but while the identity of Śiva and Jiva makes fear and boredom, mentioned in later parts, possible in Sureśvara's view, Rāmānuja has to suddenly change the topic and introduce the individual soul as the subject where fear and boredom is mentioned. Due to the acceptance of true and eternal duality; Rāmānuja has no way out but to bring about the fault called contextual derangement (प्रकरणसंगदोष). In fact we often come across this problem in the Vaiṣṇava view, for consistency is often sacrificed by them to bring out the meaning already decided upon on the basis of the Pāñcharatra or Vaikhāṇasa Āgamas.

The Bhāṣya informs that strong impressions of the previous life manifest in this life as soon as the occasion arises. Therefore as soon as fear of loneliness was felt by the creator, he remembered that fear was always due to another who was opposed to one, and as he was then the creator, none could be there to oppose him. It is here that we find clearly the reason for the absence of the concept of Satan in Vedānta, Zarathustra, Moses, Jesus, Mohammad etc. divided the Supreme into good or God and evil or Satan to explain the phenomenon of good and evil in the world. Vedānta viewed evil only as ignorance of the good. Thus there are not two opposite forces in nature, but merely knowledge and ignorance of the good. In the previous section, gods and demons were called the children of prajāpati (प्रजापत्य). Since evil prevails, the other religions imagine the inheritance of the original sin : sins of the father are inherited by the sons. On the other hand, Vedānta accepts the inheritance of God in the soul as reflection. Thus to Vedānta, all are basically good, though their ignorance inhibits its manifestation. Once the knowledge dawns, God (good) is manifested. The conflict of conscience to a Vedāntī is only the stage when the knowledge is not yet wisdom, The wise has no conflict. for good and pleasant has fused in him. It is the mistaken identification of the body with the soul that causes the dichotomy of pleasant and good. Once this identification is annulled, the pleasant and the good fuse into one and all conflicts of conscience come to an end. God and Satan, in other theologies, are eternally irreconcilable, one can win and put the other down, but one cannot annihilate the other for no existence can be changed to non-existence. But, according to Vedānta, Satan ceases to exist, for he is merged in to God. Theologically it is expressed in the Taittiriya by indicating that Śiva has two forms, the benign or graceful and the malefic or fearful. Fire cooks as well as burns the house. Thus Vedānta is the only religion which can solve this dichotomic experience. As soon as the knowledge gained in the previous life was manifested as memory, the fear in the creator came to an end.

Giri points out that the very fact that that fear was manifest in the creator, indicates that even the overlordship of the three worlds is within the range of suffering (संसार) and hence not liberation, even though it is the highest state which can be attained by meditative action (pg. 57; line 29). Further more, ignorance also persists in Prajāpati for he was frightened where there was no possibility of fear. That the Viśiṣṭādvaita interpretation of the passage is illogical is brought out in the annotation of Subrahmaṇya Shāstī.

Śaṅkara raises a valid objection to the possibility of liberation. Wisdom dawned upon Prajāpati due to his previous impression, which means that he had attained wisdom in his last life. In spite of that he was born, felt bored and frightened, which leaves little hope for us to attain liberation by that knowledge. But he rejects it in a masterly manner. He makes it clear that though wisdom had not dawned upon Prajāpati in his previous life, yet he attains

ined it in the creator state even without any teaching or spiritual discipline because of his specially pure body-mind complex. But for the not so pure, disciplines are necessary, though helps vary with seekers. Thus good acts done previously may help some, austerity may help others while service to the preceptor, faith etc. May help still others. However, attentive study of the Upaniṣads and logical reflection are necessary in all cases. Even in Prajāpati's case the two were accomplished in the previous life and remembered then. According to Giri, it is attachment to the body-mind complex leading to immoral actions that obstructs the dawn of wisdom. When due to Śiva's grace this obstruction is removed, one becomes wise. It is like a heavy cloud obstructing the vision of the noonday sun. The eyes, mind etc. are all there to perceive it, needing only the removal of the cloud to produce the vision. The purport of the Upaniṣads must be imprinted on the mind to gain knowledge, though the means may vary. It is on this principle that the Sūta Saṁhitā lays down that even outcasts may gain knowledge of the identity of Śiva and self through vernacular literature. Prajāpati is an individual soul who due to his infinite purity attains wisdom easily. From Viṣṇu to an ordinary soul, points out Śaṅkara, the difference is that of the degree of purity only.

Prajāpati Produced Manu and Śatarūpā who in turn produced the various species in couples. As the two being produced from Prajāpati could not copulate as man and woman so they took the form of animals. The learned editor has discussed the portion of soul and over-soul (अन्तर्यामी) and pointed out that the entry of both in the body-mind complex can be made reasonable only by accepting the Advaita position. Ranga-Rāmānuja's explanation is illogical and far-fetched.

The problem about the method of the entry (the 'how') of the pervasive into the pervaded is raised next. The entry of an individual into a village is an apt example, but how to understand the entry of eternity (omnipresent) space into a village? The water in a coconut or a seed in the mango cannot be cited as examples as they are not partless substances. Even the reflection is a poor example for the reflected and the reflector must come in direct relationship, which is impossible if one of them is pervasive and hence in eternal contact. The technical illustration of a quality entering a substance is also not proper since quality is eternally dependent on a substance as its abode while Śiva is eternally independent. The one who enters cannot be considered a new personality, for it contradicts the passages in the Veda which clearly enunciate that no new entity enters. Finally Śaṅkara supports the reflection theory which is later followed by Padmapāda, Sureśvara, Prakāśatman, Vidyāraṇya. Madhusūdana and most Vedānta authors. The position is deftly made clear that the meaning of reflection is merely being perceived in the differentiated universe. Prior to differentiation in mind etc. Śiva is not perceived, but after that He is perceived as having entered like the Sun entering water in a reflection. Thus we find that it is not that the Great master is taken up by and proves any concept on the basis of an analogy. One can similarly say that just as empty space is observed in a jar after the manifestation of the jar, while space remains unchanged, So does God enter an individual. Unlike Śaṅkara, the later writers take analogies as proofs and try making them logically perfect, least realizing the futility of their attempts.

VIDYĀSŪTRA : MEDITATION ON SELF ALONE

The Veda deals either with injunctions, or praises, or with things as they are (विधि, अर्थवाद, वेदान्त). The injunction under consideration seems to be that one *ought* to meditate upon the self. The philosophers have recognized three types of injunctions. An action that cannot possibly be known through any other source of knowledge and is ordained by the Veda is called an original injunction (अपूर्वविधि) If two or more possibilities present themselves as

alternate modes of action and the Veda restricts for a particular action, a particular mode, the injunction is restrictive (नियमविधि). If an injunction excludes all other possibilities except what is laid down in a particular instance, it is an exclusive injunction (परिसंख्यविधि). If a person desires heaven he should perform the Jyotiṣṭoma sacrifice, is an illustration for the first type because by no other source of knowledge can we determine the connection of heaven with a particular kind of action, Can we then assume that the meditation on the self leading to liberation can be only scripturally ordained ? Śaṅkara definitely asserts that this is not the case, for it is well known to all that attentive study and reasoning is the means of knowledge and since in this instance the object of knowledge is the self, one must study the works that discuss it. Thus the knowledge of the self cannot come under original injunctions. Similarly as no alternative as a means of knowledge presents itself, the second type is not possible. If the self is known once, the restrictive and exclusive injunctions are useless, for knowledge leads to liberation and not repetition of that knowledge in the form of meditation. Thus Śaṅkara boldly rejects any injunction. A true revolutionary, he never compromised with the Karma-kāṇḍa. Interestingly, at least one great Vedāntin has accepted the first, most have accepted the second and a few have taken to the third type of injunction meant here. Vāchaspati, Appaya and others have stood steadfastly to the great master's view.

However, the implication of not accepting any injunction has to be clearly understood lest a misunderstanding arises in an aspirant. Since the knowledge of the identity of Brahman with Jīva does not lead to any action, philosophically, the knowledge cannot be an object of an injunction. Brahman can also not possibly be an object. But this does not mean that the injunction about the attainment of knowledge is not valid. As Advaita is a universal religion meant for all people of all time and climes, the process differs with different aspirants. A person of Vaidika leaning and addicted to the Vaidika way of life and activities, reads about the identity in a normal way in the Upaniṣad, is attracted towards it and takes it to be an original injunction. (अव्यवधि) There will be others who have the spirit of renunciation naturally in them and are averse towards heaven etc. as well as gains like wealth, family etc. in this life. They read about God in different philosophical and religious texts and come to the Upaniṣads as one of the possible source of true knowledge. These will take the sentences in the spirit of restrictive injunctions (नियमविधि). On realising that the Upaniṣads alone have the correct view. Still others will join the order of the paramahansas and go to a teacher who is established in Truth and will be directed to pay their attention only to the Upaniṣads and thereby take the injunctions to be exclusive (परिसंख्यविधि). Though practical, these are not accepted by Śaṅkara as the real purport of the passage.

On studying the Upaniṣad, knowledge will dawn, or meditation will be necessary to gain that knowledge. Here again a variety of spiritual aspirants have to be considered. Aspirants can be divided into four classes : those who have realised the Identity, those who have attained complete purity of mind, those who can practice co-presence and co-absence (अव्यव-व्यतिरेक) and those who have renunciation or love of God. Those who have already realised the identity of Śiva and the jīva as the real purport of the Upaniṣads, and have no doubts left, need no injunction. Naturally and without effort they feel the Identity most of the time. Due to the needs of the body when they even take meals etc. they see it as a fleeting appearance. Next to them are those who have attained complete purity of mind by offering the fruits of their actions to śiva, or a dedicated life, or supreme devotion, or the practice of yoga or tapas etc. As soon as the great Identity is explained to them, they attain the wisdom and due to having attained purity of mind they need no further injunctions. But if for any reason they feel the pang of separation they follow the restrictive injunction (नियमविधि) permitted by the

master (pg 81-2). As soon as remembrance of reality returns, such a one must let the natural flow of thought, or its absence, be seen as an apparent reality and not get involved into a continuous practice of 'I am Brahman' as an active flow, for, as Śaṅkara points out, it will lead to the feeling of himself as an active agent making the witness self appear not as non-active and non-enjoyer, but the reverse. Just as no one marries off one's daughter to make her a widow, so must one not leave detachment and get attached to the mind complex, no matter how enjoyable.

The third group of aspirants are those who can practice co-existence and co-absence (अन्वय-व्यतिरेक) of the great Identity on being shown the way once or a few times. This includes the discrimination between the seer and the seen (दृक्-दृश्य), the transcendent and real (the real which is appearing as transcendent), misery and the highest joy, the one who threads through all and what is threaded by it (अनुवृत्त-व्यावृत्त). Since they have not attained purity of mind, they must do this as a practice leaving aside all other activities except those necessary for a healthy body-mind complex required for this practice. This practice of discrimination is really an act in the region of ignorance, but as it is done as a duty, the mind gets purified, the impressions become strong and doubts are asundered. Slowly does the wisdom dawn due to the exclusive injunction (परिसंख्यानविधि) followed by the aspirant.

The fourth type of aspirants are incapable of discrimination also. Due to the fruits of some pure actions of the present or past lives, they have the spirit of renunciation flaming in them or the love of God in the form of Truth (philosophy). This state may also be attained by the grace of a realised soul, or meditation on Īśvara. Since they are not competent enough to discriminate by themselves, they have to be frequently reminded by teaching the purport of the Upaniṣads. The Identity is to be explained to them repeatedly. Time and again have they to be shown the unreality of objects. They are constantly in need of a Realised soul who can keep on pointing out that He whom they are seeking is none other but their own true self. Just as in the famous story of the missing tenth person the counter is to be told that he is the last man, so has the seeker to be told that he is the sought-one. Such an aspirant attains the knowledge through reverential service (परिचर्या) of his Guru and listening to him often with full attention.

Thus we find that though the knowledge of the Identity does not flow from injunction, yet injunction does serve a purpose. It is like the statement of a person asking another to see the Sun rise. The other person sees with his own eyes and the injunction is not the cause of perception, nor does the perception flow from it, yet the statement of the injunction does serve a purpose : it directs the person's apparatus of observation towards the east. Similarly the knowledge of the Supreme self dawns only when the seeker has the apparatus of discriminating intellect (विवेक), desirelessness (वैराग्य), attentiveness, faith, forbearance (शमादि) etc and love for Brahman which is of the form of absolute freedom (मुमुक्षा), but the Guru and scriptures are necessary for directing the attention of such a one from action, meditation etc., which are the means for attaining non-self, towards the self who is Śiva.

Giri observes that though in the normal course an arrow once shot reaches its aim, yet if obstructed by a rock etc., it may not reach. Similarly may the fruits of actions be also obstructed by some practices. This may be the source of Vidyāraṇya's *Jivan-mukti-viveka* where he lays down practices that hinder the fructification of actions in this life. Though knowledge will not disturb the fructification (प्राप्तिवशयोग), yet there are means to obstruct it through medication, concentration etc. practiced by self effort. The only difficulty in this analysis is that the realised soul sees the suffering or enjoying body-mind complex as non-self and thus cannot have any motive to make that self-effort. If at all he makes any effort,

it is to recall the blissful experience, since the eternal Bliss is always present within his own self. It is interesting to note that Plato has accepted more or less the same view of predestination of the natural course of life (Republic). One must however note that words like Jīvanmukti are not used either here or even in the Brahma-Sūtra Bhāṣya by the great master. Hence Vidyāraṇya's usage of the terms jīvan and videh a mukti are in quite a different context. It is clear that he has in mind the type of aspirant who has not perfected the apparatus of knowledge to have a clear vision, whereas Śaṅkara, Sureśvara, Padmapāda, Sarvajñātma etc., have in mind the wise man with a perfect apparatus. It is a fact accepted by all that until the wisdom dawns clearly, the practice of meditative, reflective and analytical study of the Upaniṣads must be continued independently or with one's own preceptor.

The Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad is very specific in laying down that the ātman can never be an object of meditative injunction, as it does not use the objective case in the sentence (say आत्मानमुपासीत), but rather uses the indirect style, (आत्मा इति एव उपासीत page 83). One must be aware that the self is the most beloved of all, son, wealth or whatever. The Upaniṣad further states that if anything is held dearer than the self one is bound to come to grief as the self alone remains, all else dies. The editor has pointed out that the Vaiṣṇava interpretation here of self as God is contradictory because one cannot predict death for those who are ignorant of God, and thus of his being the most Beloved becomes meaningless. Since everyone acts for his own self, self's belovedness is known to all and those who contradict it basically act untruthfully and hence can be cursed by a wise person for pretending to believe what they know to be a false fact.

MAN'S ENTITLEMENT

The Upaniṣad asserts that it is only man who is entitled for this knowledge of identity with Brahman. Śaṅkara points out that man has a special right to this knowledge. Though entitlement to special Vaidika lore through birth in a particular group or entering into a special state of life (वनप्रस्थ) may make it easier to gain knowledge, it is not absolutely necessary. As the learned editor points out that even though gods have a higher state of life, yet, due to that very availability of enjoyment, they are unfit for dispassion. Thus, whether there is worldly prosperity or spiritual attainments, or their absence, all men are specially entitled to them. It is interesting to note that Śaṅkara does not accept Bhartrahari's view that the next section refers to a Brahmapa, nor the view of the Vṛttikāra that it refers to a highly developed soul, for he says that the word 'man' (मनुष्यः) in the previous section is more important than the indefinite word Brahman (ब्रह्म) here. Some maintain what a man is soon going to be is often referred to as already attained. 'Sannyāsins should give fearlessness to all beings as a fee,' or 'a householder should marry a suitable wife' etc. are statements in which the terms. 'Sannyasin' 'householder' are used in a futuristic sense. Similarly the word Brahman in the Upaniṣad [1. 4. 10] means a Brahmapa. But, the great Master points out, that taken in this light the attainment of Brahman will be a real attainment, and thereby impermanent. Thus Brahman here means nothing else but Brahman. The question may be raised how can Brahman have ignorance in his own being. Non-vedāntins point this out as the fundamental contradiction in Vedānta, and so it is if not understood properly. Vedāntins like Vācaspati and others have solved the problem by appealing to the beginninglessness (अनदिन) of the individualised self and point it out as the locus of ignorance, instead of Brahman. But Padmapāda, Sureśvara, Sarvajñātma, Prakāśātma and hordes of others have tried to tame the bull by the horns and boldly asserted that philosophically and psychologically the location of ignorance in the individualised self is neither possible nor reasonable. Hence Brahman alone is its locus. Here of

course Bhagavān Bhāṣyakāra gives a theological support to this idea. The Veda prescribe Brahman as an object worth knowing. Only when there is ignorance about something, its knowledge is prescribed. In the absence of superimposed silver on the mother of pearl, none will take the trouble of pointing it out as real. While it is directly visible in broad daylight none points out the rope and says that it is a rope, not a snake. Similarly without ignorance of Brahman there will be no pointing out by the scriptures of Its nature as unity and non-duality, and unreality of all except Brahman. It may be held that Brahman is the object of ignorance, not its subject or creator, but the subject of ignorance has to be a conscious being and since Brahman is the only real consciousness behind all conscious beings, who else can be the subject?

From theology, Śaṅkara takes a flight into theosophy and asserts on the basis of experience and the śruti that this is an existential truth which can never be contradicted by anyone. He says that we experience that the knowledge of unity dispels ignorance. Many scriptural passages are sighted by the opponent, but eventually he has to admit the truth.

Removal of ignorance is, by various thinkers, considered real, unreal, apparent etc. But Vimuktātman asserts that it is of the fifth variety transcending all the four possibilities. Giri finds Śaṅkara confirming his stand. The editorial annotation at this point is useful. The experience 'I am not Brahman' and 'I do not know Brahman' is common to all. Thus we aspire to know It. On enquiry, the experience 'I know myself to be Brahman' comes into being which removes both the experiences held earlier. The one who knows himself to be non-Brahman then, now knows himself to be Brahman. The experience is not 'I have become Brahman' but 'I know myself to be Brahman.' Thus even existentially, the locus of ignorance has to be accepted as Brahman. Thus these śrutis convey the real message to an aspirant and not a message to practice or attain anything new.

Śaṅkara next takes up the emotional problem. It hurts our faith to say that Brahman like us is a seeker and also the Vaidika text that says 'By knowing Itself It became all' hurts by its implication that it is imperfect. First, Śaṅkara makes it clear, that we, the followers of Veda, are not hurting anyone for we are merely stating the Vaidika position. So the Veda may be blamed, not we. If one has faith in Brahman and wants to please It, one should not reject Its words by fancying ideas contradicting It. The mystic metaphysician rises to the occasion and points out that not only this ignorance, but the whole phenomenal world is superimposed on It, and if the whole world can be accepted as being in It, there seems to be no problem in recognising ignorance, due to which all else is observed, to be superimposed on It. There seems to be no problem in recognising ignorance, due to which all else is observed, to be superimposed upon Brahman. Hence the ignorant Brahman is called jīva who is as unreal as the whole Universe. On the dawn of knowledge the whole universe is perceived as nothing but Brahman including himself who was earlier perceived as jīva.

I AM BRAHMAN

The greatest Upaniṣadic statement 'I am Brahman' (अहं ब्रह्मास्मि) occurs here. Brahman knew 'I am Brahman' as the seer of the sight. It is that which is immediate and direct self within all and is beyond hunger etc. and is described by negating all adjunct. Thus Śaṅkara asserts clearly that God knows God and none but God can know Himself. In the very process of knowing Him all that is transitory falls off. The Upaniṣad declares that previously whether one was a deity, sage or an ordinary mortal, all become one attaining this knowledge. This is the highest state to be attained since nothing is left out of 'all' that is known as one's own

being. By implication it is clear that the greatest sinner and saint merge into this mystic union and the wisdom is in no way affected by what one was previously for as Giri points out one knows oneself as Brahman which entered the adjuncts and not that one has *now* become Brahman. Thus it is not that a sinner or saint, a god or satans that has become Brahman, but Brahman knows Itself as Brahman. The learned editor has discussed the Vaiṣṇava interpretation of the dualists as well as the qualified nondualists and pointed out how off the mark they go to assert their pet ideas. Madhvācārya goes to the extent of interpreting 'I' (अहं) as 'the desirable' (अर्हं). It is by seeing such interpretations that Vivekānanda exclaimed that Vaidika words were Indian rubber to be extended to any extent. The Upaniṣad refers to the famous mantra of Vāmadeva in which he asserts that he is both Manu and the Sun. As subrahmaṇya Śāstri points out since Sun and Manu are father and son, the possibility of Vāmadeva taking both forms is ridiculous. Thus the only implication is that of all pervasiveness. The only condition for this realisation is that one should have no inclination for external objects. Even the gods cannot obstruct the liberation of a man of knowledge. So one should never be in doubt whether one's previous actions (कर्मा) are helpful in this or not. If the spirit of enquiry and detachment from external objects is present, the aspirant is bound to experience the truth here and now.

OBSTRUCTION TO RESULTS

The karmakāṇḍins hold that actions bring forth fruits of their own accord, no conscious agent god, gods or any one is needed. A similar view is accepted by the Jainas and Buddhists. Even Sāṅkhyas and Yogins hold a view amounting to the said idea. Naiyāyikas and Vaiśeṣikas do consider God essential for the fructification of action, but not involved in it. On the other hand the Pāñcārātra, Vaikhanas and other Vaiṣṇavas, Vāmācārīs, Samayācārīs and other Śāktas, Pāśupatas, Māheśwaras and other Śaivites consider their respective deity as more or less independent in bestowing the results or pardoning sins and even giving liberation. Sandwiched between the social norms of Paurāṇika gods just as Buddhists and Jainas had to compromise with these gods by making them emanating from the Buddha etc, the Vaiṣṇavas Śāktas and Śaivas also had to accept the lesser divinities no matter how contradictory to the philosophical atheism or monotheism position they held. It is little wonder that Advaita also had to yield to this tāntrika compromise. But since it accepted the reality of Vaidika gods it was not a philosophical compromise, being rather an extension of Vaidika into Paurāṇika gods. But once conscious dispensation of fruits of actions is accepted, an amount of freedom is to be accepted by the dispensers, whether in sequence, severity, duration, method, specifications of types etc. The problem is more complicated in religions that accept rebirth for in those religions that do not accept it only one decision of heaven or hell is to be made, while in the rebirth system where there is continuous action and fructification there is continuous interference. One cannot have a conscious dispenser who does not enjoy a free decision, for consciousness inherently presumes freedom. The various gods being limited by their very nature are bound to favour or discriminate against those under them. In practical life this freedom of gods is accepted by Vedānta. But being essentially a monotheistic religion, it also accepts the supremacy of Brahman in matters of fruits. Thus gods have but a limited power of dispensation. Yet since the ordinary earthly mortals are extremely limited, gods practically over-power them, as much as their demonic tendencies. Vedānta regards ethical tendencies as the proof for God's grace. God-realization specially in the essence of one's being, puts a mortal beyond the control of gods and hence naturally they are bound to obstruct this attainment. Śāṅkara points out that it may be as easy as to drink water for gods to obstruct fructification of results in other spheres too. One may even lose faith in the scriptures that prescribe rites for prosperity, rains;

heaven etc., for the fructification may be obstructed. One may even wonder whether God Himself wielding inscrutable and infinite Power may not withhold results. Once the possibility of interference is accepted it is even possible that time (astrological), others' actions, sacred formulae (mantra) and their use by others, herbs and chemicals and austerity etc. which are known by experience of people to obstruct, may help or hinder the fruition. Thus the whole cause and effect relationship becomes a cloudy issue. These arguments are quite valid and have led some to deny a conscious interference in actions and fruits. But God is a fundamental issue with Vedānta, with which it can brook no compromise. Nor can it question His power. Śaṅkara solves the problem by appealing to experience. Though varying in various cases, all effects spring forth from definite causes. If results are spontaneous, these should not have been observed. All people try to collect definite causes to bring about definite results. Hence, though pain or pleasure are due only to vice or Virtue, as made clear by the Veda, Smṛiti, Nyāyas and Tradition and thus can not be upset by gods, yet God, time etc. help in fructifying it. In Śaṅkara's theology we have a masterly solution. Actions create the will of God, which manifests in the form of interference of gods, time etc. as the directly observable causes to bring about results. The supreme cause is the inscrutable and infinite will of God only. Thus are reconciled Vedānta's monotheism and popular polytheism. The various gods are only one of the factors present in the cause of an event. We do not lose faith in spite of them because God's will makes all the factors to be present at the appropriate time of fructification.

This view also solves the problem of free will and pre-destination. It is always necessary for an individual to work for bringing together the factors only after which God's will comes into being. The Veda has declared that if one works with the right hand, victory is bound to be present in the left. The Gods, even if they want to thwart someone's effort, have to depend upon some previous unethical action. Where thwarting is to be done, they feel like doing it. Śaṅkara observes that there is no fixity about the relative pre-dominance of action, time, Gods, material substances etc., and because it is impossible to understand it, people are in confusion. Thus the great master is not at all a supporter of complete pre-destination as some later writers have tried to make him out. He further asserts that there are others who exclusively support one of them as the cause. Some for instance, regard previous actions as the only cause, while others hold destiny or time or the nature of material substances or all of them simultaneously. But in fact one or the other of these are more potent than the others and at that moment the potential superiority of others lies in abeyance, but eventually the result of one's actions has to be reaped, hence the Veda and Smṛitis emphasise it and reason also supports it. The emphasis of the master is that one can not be sure in what is predominant in bringing about a particular result, but one can be sure that the action will never be destroyed.

As for the knowledge to destroy ignorance and the attainment of Brahman, Gods etc., are powerless because there is no intermediate moment betwixt knowledge of Brahman and its attainment. Besides, the wise becomes the self even of the Gods and hence no God will freely act against one's own benefit. Thus Śaṅkara is clearly pointing out that after the Brahman-wisdom dawns, nothing will ever cause an obstacle. Hence a realised soul does not have to appeal to gods, time and other such factors for his own work, or for those upon whom he wishes to bestow grace for his will becomes the will of gods etc. Only those who see themselves as different from Gods etc., and seek results different from the self, being separated by space, time and causation, can be obstructed in gaining what they desire. Thus gods can only help or thwart an ignorant person and obstruct the attainment of knowledge by the non-availability of a preceptor, scriptures, faith etc. Hence an aspirant should worship the gods

with faith and devotion, be obedient and attentive to them. In reality if one worships the Supreme Godhead (षडदेव) whose limbs are the dieties, as Śaṅkara points out at a different place, all the gods are appeased. By watering the roots, branches, leaves etc. are automatically watered. This is the message conveyed in this context.

LAST MOMENT'S KNOWLEDGE

There are some thinkers in Vedānta who try to support the view that it is the last moment of life that determines the final liberation. Hence they feel that even after knowledge has dawned one should carefully repeat the experience through meditation, so that the last mental knowledge be of identity with Śiva. The idea springs from the experience that the wise men also behave in the world during which an amount of ignorance can be sensed, and their will does not seem to be supreme as asserted here. Moreover it pleases the Karmakāṇḍins to have at least this much as an assigned duty to a Paramahansa, else they feel he is beyond all norms which to their biased mind is always unethical. To them man is by nature unethical and as soon as restrictions are removed, he will stoop down. They fail to understand that however much their observed jīva may seem to be unethical, Brahman is and can never be unethical, for It is the fountainhead of all ethical actions. The allied question will naturally be raised that if the final moment's knowledge is the one that destroys ignorance, then gods time (stars) etc. can obstruct the continuity of meditation and even obstruct the final moment's knowledge. Thus as long as one lives, one must go on attending to different gods, stars etc. lest they cause any obstruction. Thus the Paramahansa can be again bogged down by innumeral duties. Hence Śaṅkara discusses the problem in great detail and makes it clear that this last moment-conception is against all experience, tradition and scriptures. If the first knowledge cannot destroy ignorance, what guarantee is there that the last knowledge will? And since life after knowledge is not of a fixed duration, the accumulated effect will differ. Moreover the physical and psychological needs can never allow a continuous stream to flow uninterrupted. All the Upaniṣads in all the Vedas hold unanimously that knowledge removes ignorance here and now, knowledge produces observable results like the destruction of ignorance, grief, delusion, fear etc.

The behaviour of a realised soul is due to the residual life force (प्राण) under Śiva's control. Hence what the others sense is due to the Divine will and not his own attachment, aversion etc. He feels the absence of all these in his very bones. As he has become one with Śiva, there is no opposition to the action ordained by him (-self) as prārabdha. Hence he transcends all ordinations and prohibitions. It is only an ignorant person who regards God different from himself and thus approaches him as a subordinate, offering praises, salutations, (sacrifices), presents, devotion, meditation etc. He can be thwarted or benefitted by the gods. But the wise knows himself to be Śiva and therefore cannot do all this in reality (i. e. realising them to be true). He may act apparently due to momentary prārabdha as he does in regards to food, promenade etc. due to previous impressions gathered in the brain matter. The actions done without the sense of being a real actor can not fructify, for example, if a prince is born but for some reason gets lost and is brought up as a śūdra and lives that life, does not get any sin for not performing the duties of a warrior. Similarly a wise has no superimposition of body-mind-complex or attributes associated with it. Whatever the others see is only God's will acting and manifesting through him.

CREATION OF CASTE

An ignorant person must perform his duties. These duties arise out of the particular situation of birth and selective situation of the stage of life. The first is technically called called

varṇa-dharma and the second, āśrama-dharma. In the former, one is absolutely dependent, while has freedom in the latter. The details of creation are given first.

The Śruti clearly states that prior to the division of varṇas, all were Brāhmaṇas, which is corroborated by a similar statement in the Mahābhārata. Agni was the first created being by the Viraj and he considered himself as Brāhmaṇa for he came out of Brahman. Hence at that stage the caste-division did not exist. Since there was none to protect the good and punish the wicked, Agni was not able to perform glorious deeds. To perform the Vaidika rites freely, he created the resplendent warrior. They are Indra, the king of Gods, Varuṇa, king of waters, Soma, king of Brāhmaṇas, Rudra, King of animals, Iśāna, king of luminaries and so on. It is from these that the solar, lunar and other dynasties have come into being. Śaṅkara says that the ruler is controller of the Brāhmaṇa though produced by him. This is an important statement for often it is said that a Brāhmaṇa is unpunishable by a ruler, but the scriptures do not support this. When a king perform the Rājasūya sacrifice he is reminded by the priest that though a kṣatriya, he is really a Brāhmaṇa. At the end of the sacrifice the king glorifies the priest. If he slights a Brāhmaṇa due to his position, he is considered wicked. Even though he has to perform his cruel duties yet if he follows the Brāhmaṇa's instructions and does not prerogate the law-making powers to himself, he does not accrue sin out of his actions. Otherwise he is bound to deteriorate. This passage is quite important for it lays down the very conception of political philosophy of the Veda. The Brāhmaṇa is the law-maker and the law makes the king. Having made the law, the power of its enforcement lies with the king. But the king must not consider himself beyond the law, else he becomes wicked. The one who gives the law should never be responsible for its execution, though the law gives may be allowed to judge the actions of the executive. In any case they should be in no position to deliver orders. Thus as compared to the Roman law where the executive, judiciary and legislative are three independent branches of the State, the Veda provides for the merger of legislature and judiciary.

Even the Brāhmaṇas and Kṣatriyas were not able to flourish in the absence of producers of wealth. Therefore did Brāhmaṇa produce the Vaiśyas viz, Vaus, Rudras, Ādityas, Viśvedevas and Maruts. All these are in groups indicating that the earning of money is always successful in groups or guilds. Individuals cannot produce much wealth. It is the co-operation of a number of people that produces enough wealth. To this day we find the limited companies working much better than proprietorship concerns. That wealth-production should not be in the hand of kings is also made plain. Obviously nationalization is not a Hindu concept. Still the world was not prospering normally in the absence of workers. Pūṣa or the deity presiding over the earth is a Śūdra. Workers can never run an industry by themselves, as they want an immediate return, nor can they plan. Thus just as Brāhmaṇa and Kṣatriya must not be mixed up, so Vaiśya and Śūdra must be kept apart. By mentioning the earth as the deity and nourishment as function, the Veda clearly lays down that all nourishment comes from the earth and Śūdra, minerals, agriculture, forest etc. are all got from the earth. Vidyāraṇya points out that only graced and controlled by Indra, Vasu, Pūṣa etc. one becomes Kṣatriya, Vaiśya and Śūdra. Hence mere birth is not the whole cause.

The Brāhmaṇas found that progress was still absent. They were afraid that the Kṣatriya being fierce may become unruly and exploit Vaiśya and Śūdra and not follow the Brāhmaṇa. Here is the seed of procrastination indicated by Śaṅkara. When one is uncertain about the possibilities of possessions remaining with the possessor or about the gains of his

labours one cannot act properly. After half a century of Communism, Russia and China have started changing their system and allowing an amount of possession and gains to the producer. Veda has clinched the matter clearly. So Brāhmaṇa created Dharma which is of the form of śreyas. Vidyāranya points out that Dharma is the conscious deity and hence controls the Kṣatriya being fiercer than him. Truth is the earthly manifestation of Dharma. Thus Veda points out that Truth is stronger than the strongest. Since Chandogya claims that truth-speaking is natural to a Brāhmaṇa, in the relative world Brāhmaṇa is the highest. And since the supremely true is the object and life of a paramahansa, he stands above even the Brāhmaṇa.

Śaṅkara points out a wonderful conclusion. An ignorant person in order to practice Dharma of a particular form identifies himself with Brahman, Kṣatriya etc. This identification or superimposition is the precondition of practising dharma. Without becoming specific in one's station and position of life virtue can neither be defined nor practised. One may conceive virtue in an abstract way but can practice only in a relative way. Brāhmaṇa is the first product and hence the natural state. Agni is the divine form and Brāhmaṇa the human form without any derangement while all others were deranged forms. The other forms come out of these forms, hence are not the natural forms. Thus to worship Brahman, either fire or the Brāhmaṇa are the best projections. All this is created so that one following the scriptural ordained life attains to Brāhmaṇa life and having attained it, renounces all to become a Sannyāsin. So the Upaniṣad goes on to observe the passions that lead one towards the physical or psychological attainments and only after going through these one attains dispassion to attain the real self. And if this is not attained all the rites are meaningless, as the Yajurveda says, 'Being divided by fire and choked by smoke they do not know their ownself' (Taittirīya Br. 3. 10. 11. 1.). A person can attain the completeness of life by considering mind as the self, speech as the wife, life force as the children, eyes as the human wealth, ears as the godly wealth, and the body as the sacrificial rite. As Giri points out since all the five parts are present, this meditation leads to the realisation of ends and means as the Sūtrātmā and knowing him as oneself, one attains unity with him, and becomes the whole cosmos.

FOOD

After dealing with the seven kinds of food for different enjoyers, Śaṅkara points out certain important factors. Food is common to all beings, while enjoying it one must be attentive and respectful towards it. The one who uses it only for enjoyment and not worship, incurs the sin associated with production of food as well as the fact that other beings who have an equal right to this common food are deprived of it. R̥gveda (X. 117.6) lays down that if one not being wise enjoys the food not offered to gods, it only brings death to him. Similarly Mahābhārata (XII. 249. 5) lays down that one should never cook food just for one self, nor should eat alone. Another passage states that even the sin of murder is shared by the one who eats a murderer's food. Thus we find that Śaṅkara is clear that one must not associate with those who are sinners. He further emphasises that it is impossible to enjoy anything without hurting the feelings of someone or the other. Hence sharing one's food with others is essential. Thus he contradicts the view of Bhartṛprapañcha that by performing Vaiśvadeva this duty is fulfilled. Śaṅkara insists that the food referred to here is common food, and it is with regards to that that the śruti says that the Lord eats the person who does not share his food with others (Taittirīya Samhitā 3. 10. 16). Similarly it must be offered to the Lord, for the Śruti lays down that one who eats without offering to Him is bound to become an animal.

Giri makes an interesting observation that the word 'desire' means desire for something different from Advaita śiva, and hence mumukṣa though seems to be a desire is not strictly a desire for it does not lead to bondage. Because of non-dual state it is opposed to attachment. Attachment is due to ignorance, which cannot be the result of right knowledge. The emotive aspect there, is not attachment (राग) but faith (श्रद्धा). Faith is to be able to face the Reality as it is manifested. Since it is anti-world, hence it may frighten in the beginning.

After describing certain meditations, rituals of birth and death as well as vows (व्रत), the Upaniṣad asserts the different types of liberation like being one with the deity, or being in his vicinity etc., and describes the world as name, form and actions as the manifest ignorance. Having shown the ephemeral nature of the whole universe, dispassion is aimed at, which leads to the next chapter.

CHAPTER II

AJĀTAŚATRU VIDYĀ

Having established that Ātman alone is worth adoration, knowing It, everything else is known, It again is the most beloved, It is to be comprehended as one's own real self, whoever knows It to be different from himself really knows it not; this wisdom is to be given in detail, for one may say that ignorance and all its details have been discussed in the previous chapter, knowledge has to be dealt with now.

Śaṅkara goes on to observe that the universe internally is the elan vital (प्राण) which sustains and illuminates and is immortal. It is like the foundation beams of a house, and is externally called Satya which is an effect and is non-luminous. It is also mortal. It is like the cement bricks etc. Elan vital again has various forms through which it manifests. He is called Virāj, Vaiśvānara Human Body, Prajapāti, Hiranyagarbha etc. depending on the locus of its manifestation. Individual and cosmic division is due to the form and not in essence. Gārgya knows only this as the final truth. He thinks that the life is completely limited by body and is an actor and experiencer and nothing more. But Ajātaśatru knows the final truth which is the unlimited and unconditioned śiva. Giri points out that the story also conveys the idea that the truth is attained by the traditional preceptor through faith and not merely by logic. Śaṅkara also says that faith is the supreme prerequisite for the experience of the supreme self.

The haughty son of Balākā, born in the family of Ṛshi Gārgya went to Ajātaśatru, the king of Vārāṇasi to teach him. Since in those days, Janaka, the king of north Bihar was the most well known king, both for his enquiring spirit and charitable disposition, generally everyone went to him. But Ajātaśatru was also equally competent. The very fact that Gārgya came to him, pleased him so much that he bestowed a thousand cows to him for the mere proposal for a discussion about śiva. This indicates the spirit which wise people have as Vidyāranya says, to speak about śiva, think about Him and discuss about Him which is the complete spiritual practice to attain the state of liberation.

Rgveda's Kauṣītaki's recension also has this story. There it is told that Balāki was continuously moving about, and so was well known as a person learned in the Vedic lore and

the indication is that he was a devotee (Bhakta) expert in the meditation (Upāsana) of the qualified Brahman, but ignorant, about the unqualified Brahman. He had been staying in the countries called Uśinara, Matsya, Kuru, Pāñcāla, Videha and Kāśī. Hence Ajātaśatru knew that Bālāki will not be able to give him any knowledge about the absolute but he wanted to make sure that a guest Brāhmaṇa of such repute should not go away without proper gift (दक्षिणा). So he made sure to give a sizable gift of a thousand cows in the beginning itself. Śaṅkarānanda points out that he was travelling around not due to detachment or dispassion but to get fame. Thus the story also conveys that one should cultivate humility to attain knowledge. Another reason for Ajātaśatru to bestow gift seems to be that the very fact of having been considered to be a fit recipient of highest knowledge deserves a gift. He has shown his humility in not questioning the Brāhmaṇa thus showing that the capacity of a person must not be questioned unless proved. Thus Śruti indicates that mutual trust is the foundation of any social communication. In the present day India it is very necessary for we are developing a society based on mistrust amongst people.

Gārgya taught Brahman respectively as the sun, the moon, lightening, space, wind, fire, water, reflection, Vitality, direction, shadow and intellect. But in every case Ajātaśatru conveyed the fact that he knew all these and also conveyed his knowledge about the different aspects of all these upāsanaś. Since the Brāhmaṇa had reached the end of his knowledge, Ajātaśatru incited him to further enquire by stating that he did not know the higher knowledge which Ajātaśatru possessed. Giri points out that a person who does this meditation without the desires mentioned as fruit therein is a fit recipient of wisdom and for that to take him higher he has to be taught that this is not the final knowledge. Kaushitaki's recension tries to divide these into Adhidaiva (अधिदेव) and Adhyātma (अद्यात्म) group. Gārgya was now ready to become Ajātaśatru's disciple. Conditioned Brahman is in the sphere of ignorance. Hence a knower of it alone is not fit to teach and yet Gārgya tried it. Now realising his limitation and also knowing that the highest truths are revealed only to an initiated disciple, he asked for it. Ajātaśatru also knew that belonging to a lower caste he was not entitled according to custom, to initiate one belonging to a higher caste. Scriptures allow a higher caste to be initiated into knowledge by the one of a lower caste, but prohibit lifelong studentship which is presumed in initiation. Śaṅkara points out another significant fact that a Brāhmaṇa who is himself authorised as a teacher should not be treated lighter by another whose nature is not that of an initiator. Thus the great master tries to distinguish between an ordinary Brāhmaṇa and a well-versed one, though he may lack a particular knowledge. Again others may not be natural teachers but are entitled to teach if they possess a special knowledge. Thus the highest truths are not to die merely because the social conduct prohibits it. Thus Ajātaśatru taught the Brāhmaṇa the final truth without making him to obescience etc. though the Brāhmaṇa had faith and respect for Ajātaśatru. This further indicates that a preceptor should never undermine the self confidence of the disciple. Hence Śaṅkara says that Ajātaśatru made it plain to the Brāhmaṇa inspite of his being taught, he will retain his status of being a teacher. This made the Brāhmaṇa still more ashamed of himself, since he was considering himself superior to this king who was superior to him both in wisdom and character (श्रेष्ठ). To give the Brāhmaṇa confidence Ajātaśatru held his hand and took him inside his house.

They came to where a man was sleeping. Ajātaśatru called him aloud 'Oh Great, white dressed, radiant, Moon'. The one who was sleeping did not respond. Then the king pressed him with the hand and awoke him. Thus the king pointed out that the Brāhmaṇa knew only that which is connected with the body mind complex and not the one who

is the master of it all. Though the master is equally present in the waking and dreaming state, but there he is not the only one who is present making discrimination difficult. In *suṣṭi* state vital force is present in the body but is unable to experience sound etc. If it was of the nature of the experiencer, it would have immediately responded, just as fire is always warm. One who got up was the master. But the one who is being taught here as well as in other *Upaniṣads* is the unconditioned, and during sleep he was not associated with the well-known adjunct of the body mind complex. Thus *Ajātaśatru* teaches the *Brahmaṇa* the supreme truth which manifests in the three states, but specially the one in which it alone exists viz. the deep sleep, where infinite bliss is manifested. And out of the unconditioned Absolute, all the organs etc. are manifested in the conditioned state. Śaṅkara goes on to discuss varieties of views about this unconditioned one. Eventually he concludes that the purpose of the teaching is to establish identity of *jīva* and *Śiva*. He illustrates it by the story of a prince who was abducted while a babe and grew up as a hunter, and lived the life of a hunter until some one recognised him and told him the truth. The prince got rid of the false identification and gained back his kingship. Similarly the absolute gains his real nature by a *Guru* and *Śruti* which has been lost to him due to beginningless ignorance. This illustration is attributed originally to the great *Draviḍācārya* who wrote, now unavailable, annotations on the *Chāndogya*, but the base is similar to a story in the *Upaniṣad* itself. Śaṅkara also points out the variety of name and form in the universe as being pictures drawn on the canvas of the absolute. This illustration is dealt in great detail by *Vidyāraṇya* in his *Pañcadaśī*, the most popular work on the philosophy of *Vedānta*.

Śaṅkara points out that the purpose of describing creation etc. is not to indicate creation etc. as real, but merely to demonstrate the unity of consciousness. If any other view is accepted the logical fallacy of a partless creating the universe of parts can never be denied. He further points out that men of discrimination and indiscrimination both act as if differentiation exists, but the former knows it to be only formal whereas the latter takes it to be real. Hence the difference accrues different results to them. Just as even a man who knows that space is neither blue nor red observes it to be like an ignorant person, but the former knows that the space is colourless in spite of its appearing otherwise, while the latter takes it to be real. Hence Śaṅkara observes that a knower must not try to explain the appearance as a change in the substratum in parts. The purpose of all *Upaniṣadic* passages indicating parts etc. is really to establish the partless reality. Nor should the soul be conceived as different from the absolute as its part. They only indicate the unreality of the difference.

Śaṅkara raises and answers in a masterly way the problem of evil in the theory of unitary consciousness. *Ānanda Giri* notes the contradiction in a detailed way and the editor has pointed out the position of the *Brahma Sūtras* on the topic. The problem is that if there is one universal consciousness, the purpose of laying down the virtues loses its significance, and even the aspirations for liberation make no sense. And if these are accepted the consciousness must be deemed to be divided at least temporarily. First, Śaṅkara deals the opponent in the form of logic called *vitanḍā*. He says that if a means of knowledge produces a knowledge it must be accepted. If on reading the *Upaniṣad* one gets the knowledge of the universal consciousness the assertion of its being not able to produce knowledge cannot be accepted. And if it does not, how can the opponent even contradict it without knowing it? To deny a thing one must know it. *Ānanda Giri* points out that actually what the opponent means is that the knowledge is fruitless like the knowledge of silver in nacre. Śaṅkara asserts that the removal of sorrow etc. are seen here and now as the result of this knowledge. Hence its fruitlessness cannot be asserted. Hence the validity of the

Upaniṣads in producing the result of sorrowless state by producing the knowledge of universal consciousness can never be denied. Actually the Karmakāṇḍa produces the knowledge of action and the fruits that follow from it without asserting their reality or unreality. Hence the Upaniṣads do not contradict the Karmakāṇḍa nor the latter the former. Both give new knowledge to man; one about the action and other about the reality. The scriptures cannot force a person into action or inaction as a master forces a servant. Even a person who knows well, the prohibitions yet indulges in vicious acts due to the intense attachment to its immediate result. Hence the purpose of scriptures is like a lamp. It enlightens us about virtue and vice, and it is entirely left to our will to follow it or transgress it. Ānanda Giri points out that some people prefer to be jackals in Vrindāvana rather than get liberation, for to them the highest attainment seems a non-attainment. Thus out of the letter 'D' (ॢ) gods, demons, and humans squeezed out three different meanings according to their taste. (cf. Prajāpati Vidyā Br 5.2.1-3). Thus different aspirants have different goals. Veda caters to them all. According to one's aspirations, the means are selected and followed. Hence there is no question of one part of Veda being more authoritative than the others. They are all equally valid in the sense that they all enlighten us about the proper means for their respective results. Upaniṣads deal with the knowledge of Śiva who is identical with Jīva.

Śaṅkara goes on to point out that the non-dual Absolute is not contradicted by either perception or inference. The learned editor points out the two famous writers, Bhāmatikāra and Tattvasūddhikāra as explaining this point in two different ways. One holds that perception deals with the qualities of an object and is not concerned with its being real or false. The other holds that the reality actually is reflected in the object due to its substratum which is real. Thus in one school the reality is not perceived, while in the other it refers to Brahman. At any rate, object's reality is not perceived as such. Actually if reality was perceived, its absence should also be perceptible. If it were so, we could never misapprehend the snake in the rope for along with the snake, its unreality would also be a matter of observation. The form of perception then will be 'I see an unreal snake.' But this fact is contradicted by experience. All perceptions refer to a real object during the perception, and are only accepted as unreal when contradicted by another experience which again is accepted, as real until further contradicted by another experience. The whole history of science is a testimonial to this fact. Each theory is contradicted in the light of further experiments. In the beginning scientists made a distinction between hypothesis, theory and law. A rule was hypothetical unless verified. Law was supposed to be permanent. But now all laws have been contradicted. The only law that remains is the law of contradiction. Thus an experience is valid in itself but can never be relied upon to prove the objective reality of the experience. Thus it is clear that the Upaniṣads were the first to discover this truth. Hence perception of variety and Vedic assentment of universal unity consciousness are not contradictory to each other.

As for the inferential wisdom of souls being different from each other the great master points out that the very basis of inference in this case is faulty. It is the inductive logic that should form the basis of deductive logic. 'Soul' is never an object. All experiences of variety can be referred to mind-consciousness and thus mental variety is enough to explain different people experiencing different joys, sorrows etc. due to difference in virtue or vice, we need not assert infiniteness of two, mind and consciousness, when one will suffice. And since even if souls are accepted as infinite in number, the minds will have to be accepted as infinite in number, but one can as well do with one universal consciousness reflected in infinite minds creating the impression of infinite souls. Since this inference is supported by Veda, and experience of the wise it is authoritative inference. The Great dialectician that Lord Śaṅkara is shines here in

manifest glory. He plainly asserts out of compassion that those who misconstrue the universal unity consciousness as individual divided consciousness are misguided by their intellect which is poisoned by false logics, and thus are to be pitied rather than condemned for though born as Brāhmaṇa, Kṣatriya, Vaiśya etc. have not received the real import of Veda through proper succession of teachers, making them contemptible. Thus the universal teacher that Śaṅkara is, does not condemn them and asks us to have pity on them. The editor in a lengthy comment makes many points crystal clear which would have remained muddy otherwise. Śaṅkara makes it clear that mere logic can never reveal Śiva as He really is, but can only help us to understand Veda's teaching about Śiva. He further states that the fact that the ultimate knowledge has been shown to be revealed by the grace (ॐ) indicates that only the grace of Śiva, Veda and Guru can reveal the reality. The ultimate truth is that there is no soul apart from the universal one.

ŚISU BRĀHMAṆA

Brahman has been defined as the source, sustainance and culmination of the universe. Prāṇa or life-force is also one of them. Therefore, its reality as Śiva is to be indicated in this section. Even though the purpose of Upaniṣad is to show the absolute identity, just as a travel guide should inform about the hotels, rest houses, restaurants etc. which are available en-route, the Upaniṣad indicates Prāṇa etc.

Prāṇa here is called 'Śisu' i. e. child. Vidyāraṇya points out that just as a child is not able to use his powers without the help of others, so also the life force can act only with the help of gross and subtle bodies containing the physical apparatus as well as the psychological ones like senses, mind etc. The gross body is its abode, the head etc. are the places of its manifestation. Food is the rope that binds the Prāṇa with the gross body. The sense organs are the jealous cousins whom the one addicted to this meditations brings under his will. The meditation is given in detail. The head is compared to an inverted waterpot and sense apertures of eyes, ears, nostrils and mouth are to be identified with the famous seven sages. Śaṅkara specifically derives the name Atri from the root Ad (अद्) to eat, to indicate the result told there which is that one can eat anything as the successful culmination of the meditation. Vidyāraṇya indicates that the change of grammatical form from Atti to Attri is due to the Vedic injunction that directly naming the great ones is not desirable. The important point here is that the Ṛṣis identified with sense organs is to indicate that just as the senses see the knowledge, Ṛṣis see the reality. Moreover even the names of other Ṛṣis could be derived as psychological phenomena based on this Śruti passage. It is a well known fact of Vedic mysticism that the aspirant's stage is presented in the form of Ṛṣis and the desired stage as the Devatā of a hymn.

FORM AND FORMLESS

Satya is divided as 'Sat' and 'Tya' meaning formed and formless death and immortality, stationary and moving respectively. Both are Śiva. Śaṅkara points out that Śiva is really beyond definition, but is defined by these two which are superimposed on Him. Both together constitute the five basic elements. Here we find the seed of Smārta Pañcādevopāsana, the worship of Śiva in his five forms described in the ritualistic texts. Each of the element associated with consciousness becomes a form in which Śiva can be worshipped. Śaṅkara following the śruti lays down the sun and the clan vital as basically the formed and the formless.

In the body the eyes are the form because they are the essence of the gross materialis. Here Śaṅkara and Giri quote the Vedic theory that after insemination the eyes are the first to be

formed. A riddle in the modern scientific era where the eyes are formed much later. Since in the next verse the subtle body is mentioned as the essence of the formless as residing in the right eye, it is clear that eye is the abode of the subtle body. Hence it is possible that the zygote and the chromosomal arrangements in it may be in the eye for it is there that the subtle body finds its gross manifestation. Since the chromosomes are the predeterminants of the life pattern of an individual, they can clearly be the eye of the individual consciousness. Śruti further points out the form of the being in various ways. Śaṅkara makes it clear that the subtle body consists of impressions produced by gross and subtle objects associated with the individual self. The subtle body is variegated like a picture on a canvass and is like an illusion or magic and hence puzzles even great thinkers like the Buddhists, Kapilites, Kaṇāditas and even some Vedics like Bhairaprapaṇcha whose later followers like Rāmānuja and others try to imagine theories to satisfy the logicians and naturalists, thereby contradicting themselves as well as the Vedic text. The learned editor has pointed out both the views and their inner contradictions. Here Śaṅkara points out a fundamental principle of Advaita that no interpretation is correct, if it is unwarranted by the literal text.

Śaṅkara observes that it is impossible to ascertain the beginning, middle or end of these impressions. Neither can their number be predicted, being infinite in measure, nor the place, time and circumstances of these impressions, for they have endless causes. The most comprehensive is the impression of Hiraṇyagarbha which is like a flash of lightning. In him all is manifested suddenly. The aspirant who meditates thus becomes full of splendour (श्री) like him. The idea is that each impression must be construed as that of Hiraṇyagarbha like a flash of lightning wholly complete in itself without beginning or end. This meditation leads one to the realization of the same splendour.

Having thus described that which defines Brahman, the Upaniṣad goes on to assert that the truth of truth is that which transcends both these definitions. The negation is repeated twice to indicate that not only the two described here, but all the other means of defining him must be transcended to attain the truth of truth. Elimination of all limiting adjuncts leads to the realization of one's identity with Brahman which is the truth of truth. It is only when the desire to know about the abode, time and everything else except Brahman is eliminated that the homogeneity of Pure Intelligence having neither an 'in' nor an 'out' is realised. The intellect there is centred in one's own Ātman.

Śaṅkar points out that Brahman is described by means of superimposed name, form and action to direct our attention away from all else and then describe it as free from all these adjuncts thereby eliminating all specifications. The latter is done only after a person has developed devotion concentration, self-surrender and intense love for Brahman. Without these, the aspirant may go astray in thinking that It is little more than, even if It is, nothing. Here also the same procedure is followed.

MAITREYI BRĀHMAṆA

Having described Brahman the Upaniṣad lays down renunciation as the means to attain It. All the injunctions and prohibitions are for specific ends in the universe. Since the ends imply a desire, and that is absent in the aspirant of the Real, they are defunct for him. No rites or rituals are ever efficacious in dawning the Real. Even though the contradiction between action and knowledge is self evident the Upaniṣad wants to leave no doubt about the fact that Brahma Vidya associated with any other Sadhanā does not lead to its fructification. It is abandoning of all accessories expressed in monkhood (vagabond life) that lead to its fructification. Giri points out that the life of a monk is essential not merely because he is

able to hear, think and meditate in abundance because of being free of all other duties, but is essentially laid down as a 'must' by the Vedas just as other means are laid down for other ends. Śaṅkara defines renunciation of all the means that can fulfil any desire worldly or godly. The occasion chosen to describe this renunciation is important and interesting. In a way the muni Kāṇḍa or the Yājñavalkya Chapter may be considered to have started from this point onwards.

Yājñavalkya was a performer of his duties and wants abandon it to become a monk renouncing wealth etc. which are means to satisfy desire. He teaches the knowledge to his dearest wife Maitreyi, who being a woman has no right to do any ritual while depreciating wealth. Thus the teacher renounces what he has and teaches to the one who does not and cannot possibly have the means. All actions need wealth. To decry wealth is self-defeating, if Realization needs any action. Moreover the differences of Varṇa and āśrama are effaced from one's consciousness which they are essential to determine duties of an individual. Without duties being fixed for an individual by his station of life, they can not be performed. And if one goes on asserting one's individuality in a social or psychological context it is impossible to realise the true nature of one's own being. Thus the theory that performance of duties is essential to knowledge is self-contradictory for in performing them one identifies himself with that very body-mind-social complex which he has to transcend. Śaṅkara is never tired of pointing out that monkhood which belongs to a social context is entirely different from the paramahansa type. The former belongs to the domain of actions and many rituals, rites and duties are laid down for it. The paramahansa described here is one who has renounced the desire even to attain the Saguṇa-Brahman, Brahmaloḥa or the state of Īśvara. It is only these that are the subject matter of the Upaniṣads and are beyond all injunctions and prohibitions. These have no external determinants. Though this is the natural outcome of knowledge as in the case of Yājñavalkya, it is also to be practised by the aspirant to attain it. Moreover, any duty performed without complete faith is not efficacious. Once the doubt has arisen about one's being a Brāhmaṇa etc. the duties become fruitless. The questioning mind reaches a stage when one is not sure who one's father is or what one's nation is. The soul through transmigration has given him innumerable parents and nationalities. Which of them is truly his? Once these questions have arisen it is meaningless and fruitless to perform any actions for one's own duty is doubted ('वशब्दा) prior to determining one's own real nature. Hence it is laid down that once the desire to know one's real self has arisen, one must not go on with the mechanical performance of doubtful duties. After the answer is attained it is impossible to perform them for individuality is lost in the universal. If at all he acts, he acts out of absolute freedom (निरतिशयम् ऐश्वर्यम्) like Śiva. and not out of any sense of duty rising out of injunctions and prohibitions, or to fulfil any desire or ends. All his actions are merely sports issuing forth out of fullness of love knowing all to be his own self. Thus Karmakāṇḍa and Jñāna-kāṇḍa are meant for two stages of aspirants rather than fusion of two for the same aspirant at the same stage.

This particular insight of the great master has often been misunderstood and criticised by the followers of action oriented life and often to satisfy them watered down by many of his followers. The stage has reached when even paramahansas who had clung to the essence of the master's teaching faithfully have started compromising. Action orientation in the field of social service, whether medicine or education, is becoming the in-thing. But the poison of action, once injected will lead the aspirant astray though the wise will laugh it off. The older generations compromised with the rituals of worship etc. and the modern one is compromising with social activities. Both are against the essential teachings of the Upaniṣads and Śaṅkara, Sureśvara, Padmapāda, Vidyāranya and a host of traditionalists. It is against all logic and

psychological analysis. We have nothing against either the older type of action-orientation, a life of worship etc, to be indulged by the monks other than Paramahansas, who desire some other end than the Real, nor do we have any thing against social service indulged by others. Both are a great help to the purification of mind, which may some day lead to the enquiry of Brahman. But we definitely want to warn those enquirers who are desirous of nothing but the Real, that no action can ever lead to it and can only take one away by asserting a particular station or duty. Renunciation of all actions including the means to actions like sacred thread, tuft etc. for the worship action and scholarly degrees and worldly knowledge etc. for social action must be renounced completely to attain the Real. We are also conscious that in the name of Paramahansa, many lazy people full of desires and aspirations try to avoid their duties and transgress injunctions and prohibitions. But merely because of misuse, truths cannot be denied. Just because medicine is misused, one cannot condemn it. Basically since a paramahansa demands and expects nothing from society it has nothing to fear from him. Anyone who expects anything from anyone is not the seeker of truth. Society is at perfect liberty to lay down all the restrictions it wants to avoid the misuse of this order, a Paramhansa has nothing to fear. Thus even socially he poses no problems. Ramakrishna, Ramana are the shining examples of such Paramahansas in modern times.

The Ātmapurāṇa tells us about the earlier life of Yājñavalkya. He was extremely intelligent and compassionate as a student. Once his compassion was misunderstood as arrogance by his teacher. Having been asked to renounce all that he had learnt by the teacher, Yājñavalkya decided not to learn from any human teacher and thus having performed austerity asked Āditya to bestow Vedic knowledge to him. Being pure of heart and having a realised being as his teacher, at the end of his education he wanted to become a monk and spend the rest of his life in deep meditation. His famous work on yoga is a proof of his deep knowledge of the Science of meditation. But Āditya asked him to propagate the ritualistic teachings of the Veda first by leading a house-holder's life. This was the fee demanded. Yājñavalkya had no option but to comply with his teacher's wishes. He married twice and opened up a university to impart his ritualistic knowledge in which he taught the different Vedas. It is clear that he became a famous and renowned teacher much sought after by such kings as Janaka. As he grew old, suddenly the earlier desire for meditation again arose. He suddenly realised that indulging in action, he had slowly slipped into worldly life of comfort and ease. He became agitated remembering the final end of his life and decided to renounce then and there. The present section recalls that event.

The great sage called his favourite wife Maitreyi and disclosed his intention to renounce. As Giri points out, for a house holder the wife's permission is a pre-requisite for entering the life of a monk. He wanted to divide the immense wealth and property he had gained during his life, between the two wives. But Maitreyi was a woman of different metal. She wanted to attain the knowledge of Brahman, having been the wife of such a realised soul, rather than the wealth which was ephemeral. 'Katyayani can have all the wealth that belonged to you if she so wishes', so she asked him to initiate her into the wisdom that would lead to liberation.

Yājñavalkya was immensely pleased and told her that though she was always his most beloved wife, yet she was becoming even more beloved than before. He asked her to sit close to him and attentively learn the teaching that leads to the final attitude. Thus we have a teaching given by a loving sage to his beloved wife. The intimate relationship assures us that the teaching will be simple and direct. And we have a refreshing fulfilment of

our expectations. Since Maitreyi is bereft of any Vedic learning, the teaching is not loaded with Vedic terminology culled from ritualistic portion as it is usually found elsewhere.

Yājñavalkya first gives an analysis of one's love towards all the relationships whether of other human beings or things. Śaṅkara points out the purpose of it. The purpose is to develop dispassion that leads to renunciation. The great master that Yājñavalkya is, strikes at the root of their own relationship first by proclaiming that none loves a husband for the husband's sake, but for the sake of one's own self. It is important to note that Śaṅkara specifically uses the term Sannyāsa (विरागमुत्पादयति तत्संन्यासाय (२.४.५)) to indicate what later came to be known as Sureśvara's view that even women and Śūdras are entitled for the sannyāsa which is an accessory to liberation, even if they be not entitled for the formal sannyāsa. The purpose is to indicate that the self is the most beloved, hence must be realised in its true nature. The means of realisation is to hear about it from a realised soul through scriptures, analyse it rationally and then remain firm in it mentally. Giri makes it clear that hearing is the main instrument, for it is the direct means of knowledge. Rational analysis and firmness are accessories for they remove obstacles of doubt and forgetfulness. On repeatedly practising all the three simultaneously or consecutively one attains the vision here and now. Sufficient practice is that much practice which gives the vision. Mere hearing cannot bring about the result of liberation for it can not destroy the obstacles. Śaṅkara points out that the varṇas Brāhmaṇa, Kṣatriya etc. and āśramas like Brahmacharya, Sannyāsa etc. that impose duties on the self through the ignorance and the sense of actions means of action, fruit of action are all annihilated totally like the snake in the rope on realisation. This is direct experience. Hence Vedānta results not in another worldly experience but in a very much this worldly experience. It is here that science, philosophy and religion merge into one. It is interesting to note that the reading of Śaṅkara's text seems to be identical with the one in the fourth chapter in the present text. Vidyāraṇya's text is the present text. The meaning of course is the same. Yājñavalkya declares unequivocally that the realisation of self leads to omniscience. Thus though creation is not mentioned in this section one must conclude that self is the only cause both material and efficient, for otherwise knowledge of one thing cannot lead to the knowledge of another. the Upaniṣad declares that if anyone sees anything as separate from the self, he is condemned or rejected by it. After illustrating the truth through different musical instruments, Yājñavalkya goes on to demonstrate that the Vedas are the natural out pouring of self. The illustrations suggest that Yājñavalkya was a musicologist, an idea we find even in his Smṛiti where a musician is declared as one destined to go to the highest abode of Brahman. Music as the important element in spiritual concentration is a major contribution of Vedic Dharma and is followed even today in practice by all branches of Sanātana Dharma.

Though the Upaniṣad uses terms like Purāṇa, Itihāsa, Sūtra, Vyākhyān etc., Śaṅkara makes it clear that they do not mean famous works of the great authors, for it will contradict the authority of the great ones and their labours. It is well known that Vyāsa wrote the mythological works called Purāṇa and Mahābhārata. They were not handed down to him by God, nor were they natural like breathing out. Vālmīki wrote Itihāsa i. e. the historical work of Rāmāyaṇa and Yoga-Vāsiṣṭha. Bādarāyaṇa, Jaimini, Kaṇāda, Gautama, Āpastamba etc. wrote Sūtras. Hence the reference here is to mythic, historic, aphorismatic and such other portions of the Vedas themselves. Śaṅkara takes the occasion to declare that the Veda alone is the final authority on Brahman and Dharma, being manifested without the intermediateness of intellect. That which is mediated by intellect can be contradicted by it, but not that which is

immediate Vedic knowledge about Brahman and Dharma which are immediate like colour-knowledge is immediate to the eye without intellectual intervention. No other book even claims to be so, for they take pride in the particular teacher who revealed them. Thus the works of all other religions are Smṛtis and not Śruti. Brahmasūtra calls Kapila's view as a Smṛti and Manuśmṛti as contradicting this Smṛti, leading to the final court of appeal that is Śruti. On this basis a harmony of all religions can easily be established.

Yājñavalkya points out that in knowledge all is submerged and after death no special knowledge remains. Śaṅkara is quick to point out that on the dawning of knowledge even while in body the specific identifications of caste, relationships etc. become defunct, then what to speak of their absence after death. Gīri points out that even in deep sleep such unidentification is observed. It is for this disassociation to be completely established that Yājñavalkya is yearning for sannyāsa. Maitreyi becomes confused on hearing two contradictory statements that one is full of knowledge and bereft of specific knowledge in the state of selfhood. It is a natural confusion, for all our life we have confused knowledge into specific knowledge which is true of all objective and subjective knowledge. But an analysis will show that bereft of subject and object the pure knowledge is bound to be non-specific. Specific knowledge is always a divisive knowledge for it is knowledge associated with something else. In the state of realisation only knowledge remains and nothing else. Thus knowledge never becomes known, just as sugar is never sweetened. It is just knowledge or sweet.

To complete the story we must quote the future passage (p. 283) which says that Yājñavalkya after mentioning that this is the complete teaching of immortal self became a monk. Śaṅkara points out that this is all that Yājñavalkya had to teach his most beloved wife to attain immortality. The whole story is so touching and beautiful that one wonders the greatness of that realisation which makes one renounce the most beloved relationship for its full attainment without disturbing the love in both of them. One has to transcend body consciousness completely to attain to this love and this realisation. The Purāṇas mention that Maitreyi also became of renunciate after hearing the teaching, without of course the external symbols, which are useless to one interested in Realisation.

MADHU BRĀHMAṆA

The next section is to contradict any other causality to the universe. The argument is that whatever is helpful to each other has one cause. Everything in the universe is helpful to each other, hence it must be rooted in one cause. The word 'Honey' is chosen for it is produced by many bees. Similarly earth is the result of actions done by all beings who experience it. Similarly all beings are produced by the earth. Thus they help each other. This shows the eternality, for both are cause and effect. The actions of souls result in the objective reality and objects give the ground for further action. This principle of cooperation is the teaching of the Upaniṣad. It gives us a philosophy of life more comprehensive than Marxism or even humanism. It is not a philosophy of confrontation or class-war. It is a philosophy of harmony, tolerance and mass-cooperation. India withstood the onslaught of mighty Islam because of this philosophy of life and could create the harmonious note in Kabir, Dadu, Nanaka in the midst of the onslaught without any malice towards the evil doers, even while fighting valiantly as represented by Vijayanagar, Chittaur, Marathas etc. History of India has not been written by the Indian standards. A battle according to Hindu concept is not to be fought merely in the battle ground as commonly understood, though undoubtedly that is a very important aspect of life. It is to be fought in the heart of man and social and economic norms equally. In a

sense cultural conquest (वसुधैव कुटुम्बकम्) is the goal and not merely national conquest. Anyone can see that on this score mighty Islam had to yield to the Hindu views, much more than Hindu to the Islamic view. There may have been loss of territories and numbers by conversion, but the Hindu that survived after the one thousand years of continuous struggle was more or less unchanged. It could produce a Dayananda, a Ramamohan, Ramakṛṣṇa, A Vivekananda all equally deep rooted in the ancient tradition. But did Islam survive the battle? Was it unchanged? Could it produce such geni, out of the territories and numbers that it acquired? The answer is obvious. Hence Muslim period of history must be renamed as the period of Victorious Hindu Survival. Hindu could do it because he has the Madhu Vidyā.

The word 'Honey' is important in another way, It brings to the mind the sweetness of love. Universe is outpouring of love of Śiva. Hence it is full of sweetness. Bitter taste or misery is not because honey is not sweet, but because we are suffering from jaundice (पित्त). Once this disease of ignorance and desire is got rid of, the universe tastes like the sweet love that it really is. Buddhism and Jainism regard the universe as miserable in its essence. Materialists regard it as loveless in its essence. It is only the Hindu who regards it as the outpouring of sweet love and hence neither miserable nor loveless in its essence. We are here to taste this loving sweetness as Jivanmuktas, and not suffer a miserable life. Thus the two aspects of life bring a wholesome view which is yet unsurpassed in any other social philosophy. The underlying unity is the Brahman and its knowledge is the means to immortality by which one becomes all viz. one with the universe. Thus the state of Jivanmukta is not neglectful of others but pouring out loving sweetness to every one. Since he sees the Paramātmā everywhere, this loving may be called Bhakti and since it brings about the welfare of all it can be called Lokasaṅgraha, but in essence it is just natural (सहज) to him and brings about no sense of doership.

One important statement by Śaṅkara is noteworthy where he mentions man as belonging to one jāti, and further notes that only by being associated with a particular body-sense-mind complex belonging to one jāti brings about utility to others. Thus Śaṅkara regards all mankind as one and only in that sense can it function being useful to other species. Probing the matter still further he says that man is again external and internal. Thus many be externally men yet internally may be far from being so. These observations of the great master have many ramifications which can form the subject matter of great search. Here we have merely indicated the direction towards which Sarvajña Śaṅkara wants to lead those who are desirous of attaining the madhu vidyā. The Upaniṣad itself asserts these aspects by proclaiming that just as the spokes of a wheel are entered in an axle so are all the beings, gods, heavens, vitals centred in the self. Śaṅkara points out that self here means a realised soul, who is identified with the supreme self. To make his view clearer he quotes the saying of Vamadeva that he is Manu and also Sūrya. Thus a wise man sees all rooted in his ownself, and nothing different from his own self. Appaya in his Siddhantaśaṅgraha develops this idea into Śiva-Bhava of the Mukta. From the standpoint of adjuncts he is the all-adjuncted one and yet from the real standpoint he is bereft of all adjuncts. Here we find the Brahma-Sūtra view (4.4.3.5-7) of Bādarāyaṇa clearly enunciated and we also learn that Audulomī and Jaimini present a partial view. Some people regard Bādarāyaṇa's statement as a Praudhivāda. But a close analysis of Madhu Vidyā and Śaṅkara's annotations make it clear that those who cannot comprehend this reality and see only logical inconsistency in this position depending on their own intellect as guide, get immersed into the ocean of misconceptions. Seeing logical contradictions everywhere they never cross the ocean of ignorance. And so only the ones who follow the path shown by traditional wisdom are capable of crossing.

Having explained the knowledge and its means the Upaniṣad goes on to tell a story to illustrate how important this knowledge is. Even the gods Aśvinīs had to study it under great duress from Daddhyañ Ātharvaṇa. This is indicated in the Pravargya section of the Śtatapatha-Brāhmaṇa but the Madhu Vidya is taught not there, but here to indicate its importance. The vidyā was restricted by Indra instructing Daddhyañ Ātharvaṇa not to teach it to anyone, or else he would be beheaded. Though Daddhyañ Ātharvaṇa had promised to teach the Aśvinīs before this order, he indicated his inability to do so after it now. The Aśvinīs found a way out. They beheaded him first and transplanted a horse's head and when that was beheaded, re-transplanted the original head so that Daddhyañ Ātharvaṇa could complete the teaching of the rest of Madhu Vidya. Such thus is the importance of mutual helpfulness taught here. The section ends with the repetitions of the name of the traditional teachers in their order of succession.

THE THIRD CHAPTER OR YĀJÑAVALKYA CHAPTER

The first portion of the Upaniṣad, viz. Madhukāṇḍa is mainly the Śravaṇa technique in as much as the knowledge is handed down in a raw fashion. The present chapter is mainly rational demonstration of the very same truth. Though at first glance it appears repetition of the same teachings, actually it is not so, the mode of presentation being different. As the Great Master points out that when traditional teaching and rational demonstration is simultaneous the knowledge becomes crystal clear in the mind of the seeker. The story of Janaka's gift of cows indicates charity as means to knowledge. Even in logical text the company of knowers and arguing with them about the truth is regarded as a means of learning. Lord Śaṅkara makes one important observation that even where scriptures have a different purpose to teach than what the story conveys the story may still be used to demonstrate another purpose. Thus illustrations, like Sūtras, may have various implicial senses, naturally not contradictory to each other. Thus in an obvious sense Janaka wanted to determine who was the wisest person. But in an associated sense it can be indicated that charity, association with the wise and logical discussions are important means of knowledge. Also it is in praise of the knowledge that even by giving expensive gifts one should try to gain wisdom.

Janaka announced that the wisest would be given as gift one thousand cows adorned with golden ornaments. This was at the end of a sacrifice in which all the Brāhmaṇas of Kuru and Pāñchāla had assembled. None dared to claim the gift, but Yājñavalkya asked his student to take the cows away. Naturally all the rest were enraged and questioned his propriety to take the gift. The chief priest Ashwal asked whether Yājñavalkya considered himself the wisest. Yājñavalkya answered, 'I bow to the wisest. I need cows, that is all'. Thus Yājñavalkya demonstrated his fearlessness and humility—the two invariable qualities of a wise one.

The argument ensued in which many topics were discussed. Many of them dealt with rituals and many others with theosophy. We need not enter into the former for most of the rituals are not prevalent today. But the main purpose of the Upaniṣad will be served by the later discussions.

Time is divided into two ways to understand the transcendence of death, which is basically a point of time. Day and Night is one division and tithi is the other one. The first is determined by the sun and the second is determined by the Moon. Since the Sun has no day or

night divisions in itself its meditation leads to immortality. The tithi is caused by wind which causes the moon to move. Hence identified with wind one crosses the tithi also. Śaṅkar appoints out the Mādhyandina recension to show how the two texts are complimentary. This is the indication which Sureśwara has often utilised to show harmony between the two recensions. The editor has made plain the methodology of the harmony here.

SAMPAT MEDITATION

Meditations based on resemblance are treated next. Agnihotra or some such insignificant rite with inferior results is meditated as Aśvamedha or other rites with superior results, by means of some resemblance, while performing Agnihotra etc. By thus meditating, fruits of a higher rite are attained. Or it may be a meditation on some part of the lesser rite as those very results. These meditations are called Sampat meditations. The bigger rites, inspite of all care, are difficult to finish without some defect. But any one who does his agnihotra regularly can yield the higher results by these meditations. Big sacrifices like Rājasūya, Puruṣamedha, Sarvamedha etc. can not be ordinarily performed by most of the Brāhmaṇas, Kṣatriyas or Vaiśyas. Thus these passages will be of no use to them except for daily recitation. Sampat meditations are useful to them to attain those fruits. Hence these are described.

ORGANS AND OBJECTS

The emancipation from death has been dealt with. Death is, being centred in the attachment to Grhas (organs) and Atigrahas (objects) due to the beginningless Avidyā. Organs and objects are also limited by their relations to the body and the mūhūrtas. Liberation from this relative existence, i. e. the existence in aims to be attained and means to be followed, has to be attained. Since it is man who can be conscious of this existence, the nature of death is being described. Even the Being in the Sun who is described as having attained emancipation is again related to death in a way by asserting that death has many forms. It is clear, that organs and objects are also forms of death and they are not absent in the Sun or in the one identified with it. And this has been clearly asserted by saying that 'heaven is the body of the mind and Sun its luminous organ.' Śaṅkar Bhagavad points out the views of some Vedantins that all the Vedic rituals lead to liberation and that the fulfilment of desire is also a step towards liberation. In a brilliant discussion he shows the hollowness of this view and points out the contradiction inherent in it, with both the scriptures and rationality. He concludes that the cause of activity and its cessation can never be the same. If it were so the universe would have ceased to exist a long time back since all those who indulge in action would have attained liberation. Thus the two paths are entirely different, and can never be related in a causal way. Such passages in the Bhāṣya give lie to many modern followers of Śaṅkara that Vaidika karma is also a means to liberation eventually. Thus a person given to the path of liberation must keep away from all activity that is different from being directly helpful in śravaṇa and manana. Only the Paramahansa Sannyāsis hold on strictly to this view. Others either compromise with Smārta and Paurāṇika worship etc., or devotion, or more recently, socially useful activities. All these are far removed from the path of liberation, and those who follow the great Master must eschew all such short cuts, which are not only no cuts but pathways leading to different goals altogether. Rābhaga's son born in Jaratkaru lineage takes up this question in detail. The organ of speech is graha. Śaṅkara makes it clear that being confined to one particular body conveys things that are untrue, pernicious, rude, offensive etc, being attached to one's likes and dislikes. Thus it controls or captivates people, making it a Graha. It is controlled by the Atigraha for people are impelled by it and then get into troubles. All other organs and objects are described in the same way. Yājñavalkya in a masterly

way demonstrated that death having destroyed all is destroyed by Śiva who has no destroyer, as He is the last to have survived. It is clearly pointed out that a person who has realised does not go with his organs, impressions etc. but is merged into the Divine the moment the body dies. The organs etc. are merged into him. This is one of the few places in the Upaniṣads where these two things are made clear. The body has two aspects. One that is observed by all, and hence is the creation of actions of all those who see it. But another aspect is seen by only the soul that resides in it. It is he who sees it as having organs etc. The organs (इंद्रिया) eye, ear etc. are only associated with him and not others. And it is these subtle bodies that are created by God at the beginning of creation out of non-pentad material substances. Ignorance consists in identifying them with one's own real self. Due to this identification the world outside is observed. And it is this that causes action etc. They are dissolved when ignorance and its impressions are destroyed at the moment of the death of the body. For the ignorant the subtle body goes to attain another gross body. Since the emancipated no more has a subtle body, he does not go anywhere, really does not die and remains lying there as far as the body observed by others is concerned. Biologically we may say that the *elan vital* has merged into its sources the life itself.

Āchārya Śaṅkara takes *Bhārtrprapañcha* to task in building up a mid-station of *Apavarga* before liberation where meditation is to be practised. But without organs etc. how can one practice hearing etc. of the scriptures? The only recourse open will be identification with the *Hiraṇyagarbha*. If this is the aim one will not become a *Paramahansa* to get salvation, for one can not attain two different results, salvation and *Hiraṇyagarbha* by taking recourse to means for one of them.

Ārtabhāga next questions Yājñavalkya what happens to the organs when man dies and then the presiding deities cease to function, thus the organs become like a laid axe without the agent. Also is asked, what happens to the soul of the ignorant one. The purpose is to know the means by which the dead man takes another body and thus continues his bondage. Yājñavalkya explained that action, nature, chance, time, destiny, consciousness, void, etc. are said to be the means. But none of these can be proved as the means merely argumentatively, for each has something to contribute. Thus Yājñavalkya took him by the hand to a corner and discussed each one and finally declared action to be the main cause. That is exactly why a good or bad man is so called because of his actions. Ārtabhāga was satisfied. In this question bondage and liberation are thus dealt with exhaustively.

BHUIYU BRĀHMAṆA

Śri Śaṅkara in the introduction to this section deals exhaustively whether the actions without desire and associated with meditation can give liberation, since the previous section emphasised the action, and came to the conclusion that it is impossible to attain liberation even through such desirless actions. For action produces results, and that which is produced can never be eternal. Action can not remove ignorance as knowledge does, and an eternal result can be said to follow only from destruction of ignorance. Furthermore since dispelling of ignorance by knowledge is proved by experience and scriptures, it is unreasonable to assume any action as having an unseen power, unobservable anywhere else or in any other context. Duties also being actions can not be such a cause. Śaṅkara clearly enunciates that any peculiar result can only be accepted when definite knowledge about it is present and not merely on supposition. This is an important statement because most of the superstitions are based on indefinite knowledge and suppositions. *Paurāṇikas* hold that anything is proved unless otherwise disproved. This is to take *Śabda-Prāmāṇya*

in a wrong way. Any statement is true if it comes from a person who knows about it and he must also be able to supply a proof for it viz, the source of his knowledge. In the case of the Veda it must be interpreted rationally to give true knowledge and not merely given an interpretation that contradicts other sources of knowledge. Based on harmony with other means of knowledge only the Vedic words convey the true meaning. Thus Śaṅkara is clear that only after proper search we should accept a theory. This is accepted by Kumārila Bhaṭṭa and the editor has quoted his view on the topic. Just as the sun does not cease to shine just because one can argue against it, so the Vedic knowledge does not cease to exist just because the meaning is changed due to human ingenuity. Thus this section is to lay down that the actions can lead only to relative results.

Bhujyu asked about the ultimate results of action by telling a story of his life showing that he received the knowledge from non-human source. But Yājñavalkya gave the answer that where the sacrificers of the horses go, there the descendents of Parīkṣita go, and that is the cosmic vital air. It is this vital force that has taken all the living forms. In the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa Bhimsena, Ugrasena and Śrutasena are mentioned as Parīkṣitas. Or 'Parīkṣita' may mean the Aśwamedha yajña itself. Parīkṣita can mean the performer.

UṢASTA BRĀHMAṆA

In this portion the Self as a distinct reality is explained. Once the Self is realised as unconditioned, one attains the state of freedom. Uṣasta asked about that Brahman which is identical with the self and is immediately, directly present within all. Yājñavalkya told clearly that it is 'you', the self, who is in all and who is the cause of all vital movement causing the organs to function. Śaṅkara points out that the body is like a wooden puppet (or a robot in modern terminology). It needs an intelligent principle to operate it, and the self is that principle. Thus the self, the intelligent principle, is distinct from the body and organs, and though existing in them transcends them and utilises them towards a goal. This is really the reason why worshippers of God or a sacrificer (देवयाज्ञी) is distinct from the worshipper of the Supreme self (आत्मयाज्ञी). Manu clearly mentions that the worshiper of the Supreme Self is the one who sees Him as equally present everywhere and always. This equanimity is his real worship. The one who has performed in this or previous lives his duties, alone is fit to attain that state. The idea is that if one is devoted to this worship, it is clear that he has finished all his duties. Only a Paramahansa can worship thus, whether he has the external insignia for it or not.

The editor correctly points out that Kahola's and Uṣasta's questions refer to the same subject. Kahola's question is about the Supreme, whereas Uṣasta's question is about the means to attain it. Once the individual self is understood as different from the adjuncts of body, vitality, senses, mind, ego etc. one realises it as being beyond the afflictions of hunger and thirst. He further points out that though Rāmānuja interprets Ātmā here as Viṣṇu, it is too far fetched, since the "directly experience" is interpreted as "all pervasive", and "life" as "inhalation and exhalation." Thus the indirect meaning is given to well understood words without giving any reason. Madhwa further imagines that since the Lord eats or sees everything directly hence he is called (अपरोक्षः). To interpret words in this way is the precursor of later Dayānandas who try to interpret all the texts by such imaginary derivations. It is such fantastic derivations that prompted Vivekananda to remark that the commentators thought the Vedic text were like India-rubber that could be extended to give any meaning.

Śaṅkara clearly distinguishes between the apparent sight (experience) and the real sight (experience). The mind with the sense is the cause of apparent experience. Since it is

absent in the beginning, appears at the moment of contact, and again is absent afterwards, it can be clearly perceived. It is but natural that a thing stands out in the background of its opposite viz. its absence. A dark spot on a white sheet is evident, but a white spot on the same sheet is unmanifest unless seen deliberately and with concentration. Similarly one experience on the canvas of its non-experience is evident. But the real experience is never absent. It is the very nature of the Seer. It neither appears nor disappears. Hence only by deep contemplation can it be perceived or felt. Its manifestation is really its association with an apparent experience. Just as light manifests when it comes in contact with an unlighted object, the experience manifests when associated with an inert object. The commentary points out the pitfalls of certain philosophers who try to interpret this passage differently and realising the impossible task that they want to accomplish, go to the extent of denying the passage itself. They blame the reciters of Vedas as having handed down the wrong formula. But Śaṅkara, as a modern critical editor, sticks to the reading as handed down, since all the reciters in various recensions have an unaltered reading, and puts the blame on the intellectual calibre of the philosophers. Though as a liberal he does not criticise the malafide intention of the philosophers, an unbiased view is bound to blame them for the same. The necessity is to interpret the passage as rationally as possible and that is what the Great Master accomplishes.

KAHOLA BRĀHMAṆA

Having described the bondage in the form of Graha and Atigraha, the bound and the bondage were explained in answer to the question of Uṣasti. Kahola's question is for enlightening about the means of liberation which consists of the wisdom and renunciation. Kahola belonged to a branch of the Ṛgveda connected with Kuṣītaka. He goes about the problem directly by asking about that which is immediate and direct as presence felt within all beings. Yājñavalkya points out the presence as being beyond the psychological and physical coordinates and its knowledge thus is the basis of total renunciation, or Śannyāsa. Sannyāsa thus is fundamental to the wisdom of the Non-dual Brahman. It is often argued by the modern thinkers that it was Śaṅkara who eulogised and magnified the concept of Sannyāsa. The Vedic lore, they feel, is either antagonistic to it or at best condescending. Actually many ancient writers were also confused on this issue. Karmakāṇḍa and Upāsanakāṇḍa of the Veda is quite extensive and covers the complete life. Sannyāsa has nothing much to be talked about except that all that has been ordained and prohibited relates to the field of desire, and once the wisdom has uprooted the desire, the whole of Karmakāṇḍa and Upāsanakāṇḍa referring to the full span of life becomes meaningless. Sannyāsa of the Vedic lore is not to bind the wise one to a new code of conduct, but to free him from all the codes. This is the Paramahansa Sannyāsa.

The passage here refers to the brāhmaṇa as the one who renounces. The question arises what is its meaning. The master points out that those who have realised themselves as the ever-free ever-contented are the brāhmaṇas, and only they are entitled for total renunciation. The passage may be construed as referring to those brāhmaṇas who have realised the ever-free nature of their own self, but such construction puts double restriction unnecessary. The Vārtika thus points out that in the renunciation born out of wisdom all are entitled, the restrictions being applied only to the renunciation of those who have yet to attain wisdom. In the Mahābhārata Vidura, born a Śūdra, is referred to as a Sannyāsī, and Āchārya Lakṣmīpati has explained it in this way in his comments. Such a renunciation has no definite external form, and is the Vyutthāna viz. rising up in the opposite direction. Rising in the external world which includes Svarga, (heaven) and Vaikuṇṭha (supreme abode of God) is called Utthāna. Not moving towards these but going within the soul is Vyutthāna, and this can not

be restricted. Śaṅkara raises an important point whether it is possible to rise above the desire for divine goal (दैवी वित्त) for it is for the divine goal that one renounces. He states firmly that even this is to be given up as it falls within the scope of desire, being a goal that is desired. Furthermore the Śruti has definitely described it as a desire. The Brahman is not a goal and hence not an object of desire, since it is already our own self. And it is Brahman knowledge that leads to renunciation of a Paramahansa. Yājñavalkya identifies all desires as one, since all are aimed at attaining a fruit. And since the wise renounces desire, he is entitled neither for any activity nor the means to such activity. Śaṅkara goes on to a detailed discussion about such a renunciate. He clearly states that those who came to know about Brahman renounced ritualistic actions and their means like the sacred symbols, entered the order of Paramahansas and lived by begging, not even keeping the symbol of a monk to keep themselves unknown. The great master is clear that these symbols are meant merely as a means of livelihood, and are bereft of any spiritual values. Thus they only superimpose a sense of superiority on the individual. The ritualist puts up a stiff fight to prove that complete renunciation is not involved in Paramahansas, and even they must stick to certain ordinations and prohibitions. But equally positively the commentary goes on to prove that a Paramahansa is beyond all rules except dedication to Ātma in the form of one pointed exertion to hear, contemplate and think about it. The sannyāsa having external insignia and bound by rules and regulations is according to Śaṅkara part of the social system of Varṇa-Āśrama and can lead at most to the Saṁgha Brahman. But he is not ready to compromise his stand about the Paramahansa of the Vedic type which involves complete renunciation of all rules and symbols. Begging is also not ordained for him, but merely an obvious statement of the fact that one who has no other means of livelihood can do nothing else but beg. It has been mentioned to reject any other means of subsistence. Without getting rid of desires it is impossible to have a vision of the Supreme Being. Thus strength in this context means strength to obliterate all objects by the knowledge of the Ātma. It is this enlightenment which makes him a true Brāhmaṇa. His conduct can no more be judged by common ethics, though from a higher ethical view point all his conduct emanates from the Supreme consciousness. He is just the facile instrument of Śiva. Kahola the son of Kuṣītaka was satisfied by this answer.

GĀRGĪ VĀCHAKNAVI BRĀHMAṆA

The Vedic literature refers to a number of Ṛṣikās who were conversant with and enunciators of both, the ritualistic portions of the Vedas and the Upaniṣads. Gārgī was not only one of them but was almost the highest representative of Brahmadāśinīs. Since she is remembered in the list of those who are offered water (tarpaṇa) by Ṛg Vedins, it is presumed that she was a Ṛgvedin. She is mentioned in Āśvalāyana Gṛhya Śūtra 3.4.4, Śaṅkhāyana Gṛhya Śūtra 4.10, Atharva-Pariśiṣṭa 43.4.23 etc. She was a paramahansa and a Brahmadāśinī. The Ātma Purāṇa gives many details of her life. But undoubtedly the Yājñavalkya episode is the water mark.

Śaṅkara points out that the indwelling spirit is the subject of discussions. It is aimed at clarifying its details. Gārgī wants to point out that which pervades the universe as woof and warp. To do so she starts by asking 'Just as water pervades internally and externally the earth, what is it that pervades the water?' If water had not pervaded the earth, it would have scattered like dust. The effect is always limited and gross. The cause is relatively unlimited and subtle. Eventually it is the self that pervades all. Thus the all-pervasiveness of the self is made clear here by stages. Water, air, space, different divine beings, their king Indra, Virāṭ, Brahman are successively stated to be the cause of the former. When Gārgī

questions the limitations of Brahman, Yājñavalkya prohibits her for the question is improper. Inference should be applied where the knowledge is inferential. As Śaṅkara points out an inferential knowledge can be contradicted by a more logical inference. But no inference, howsoever logical can contradict a sensuous perception. Similarly the knowledge gained by the mystic experience or scriptures can not be contradicted by inference. The nature of the Divine Being is to be known from the scriptures or a preceptor, not by inference. To do so involves a basic contradiction. If a person who knows these rules and still disregards them should be punished. Yājñavalkya warns Gārgī about it. Being aware of this, she kept quiet. Perhaps she just wanted to test whether Yājñavalkya fell into the fallacy himself and tried to prove the mystery of the Divine Being through logical inference, which could have meant Gārgī putting Yājñavalkya in the docks. But Yājñavalkya knew well enough not to fall into the trap. This has a message for modern Sanātānists, many of whom try to prove the scriptural revelation about the Divine Beings and mystery of Divinity through logical inference. Even though they are trying to support the scriptures to start with, they are bound to end up in twisting the scriptures to suit the logical conclusions. This will eventually lead to total disregard of the scriptures and mystic knowledge, ending up in Sanātana Dharma becoming a football being kicked upon by logical players. Sensuous perceptions also give no knowledge of the Divine Being. Hence scriptures are our only guide.

A topical scientific question is discussed by the commentator. Normally water is said to be produced from fire, but here wind is supposed to be pervading the water thus suggesting it to be the cause. He points out a great scientific truth. Fire does not exist independent of solid, liquid or gaseous particles. Thus he clearly points out that fire being a form of energy can only manifest in a material medium. We know now that energy is also a form of matter. Thus the Vedic view is supported by modern physics. Until the nuclear explosion many people criticised the view of fire as matter. They thought that we, like the Greeks and the Egyptians, also thought of fire as a particle. But the statement of the great Āchārya is clear here. We know it is incapable of manifesting without a material medium, though it itself is also material.

UDDĀLAKA BRĀHMAṆA

This section discusses the innermost divinity, the 'Antaryami' or 'Sūtrātma'. The question is raised by Uddālaka Āruṇī who is famous as the teacher of the great teaching 'Thou art that'. As Śaṅkara points out since this knowledge is to be attained by approaching a teacher, Uddālaka Āruṇī starts with a story to indicate that he has attained the knowledge through proper means and not merely by logical inference.

Once during itinerary Uddālaka Āruṇī was living in the Madra-country. He was staying with Patañchala of Kapi lineage, who was a great master of sacrificial learning. Uddālaka was studying the texts relating to these sacrifices. Patañchala's wife was haunted by a celestial being whose name was Kabandha and he was the son of Ātharvaṇa. Once this being asked them whether they knew the Supreme Ruler who controlled all beings from within like puppets. None of them knew it, hence they asked him to teach it to them. He taught it and also told them to meditate on the Supreme Ruler as their internal ruler which would lead to omniscience. Uddālaka challenged Yājñavalkya to describe that Supreme being. Yājñavalkya rose to the occasion and described it in detail. This section is often referred to as the section of the Internal Ruler (Antaryāmī Brāhmaṇa) and the Vaiṣṇava tradition regards it as the highest teaching. The Gita in the eighteenth chapter refers to it in the two verses where it is said that Īśwara controls all beings. But the special teaching in this section ends with the state-

ment that 'He is the unseen seer, unheard listener, unthought thinker. He alone is the seer, listener, thinker etc. He is the eternal being. All that is different from Him is mortal.' Uddālaka realised the greatness of Yājñavalkya who came out to be adept even in this mystic knowledge.

This particular meditation is the highest devotion or Bhakti or Śaraṇa. 'The universal controller of all is my inner controller' is the knowledge that gives both, the absolute self-confidence and the sense of dedication. In later Hinduism, specially in Śrīkaṇṭha's Śaiva Viśeṣādvaita and Vīra-Śaiva sects, this concept occupies the central theme of sādhanā. Rāmānuja's Viśiṣṭādvaita and Rāmānanda's Ānandādvaita also emphasise this meditation. Thus we find that it is a practical vidyā. Śaṅkara being conscious of the attributeless Śiva as the topic of this chapter does not go deep in analysing this meditation, but Paramaśivendra has dealt with it in detail.

THE ATTRIBUTLESS BRĀHMAṆA

Though Gārgī had retired due to a technical fault she committed in questioning logically that which pertains to the realm of the scripture or mystic experience only, she was not quite convinced of Yājñavalkya's superiority. She begged of the Brāhmaṇas to be allowed to question a second time. They allowed her to do so for she was sure that if Yājñavalkya could answer her two formidable questions, he was bound to excel all in expounding the knowledge of the Absolute. Gārgī makes out the questions as dramatical as possible.

Her first question relates to the spatially and temporally all-pervasive being. She wants to know who is it that is beyond space and yet pervades all that is in space, and who remains throughout time. The idea is to know the Being that pervades and is the basis of the Sūtrātma and still is beyond it as the commentary points out. The whole dualistic universe that is manifest merges into this Being like the earth into water.

The Unmanifest, Māyā or the Divine power is that which is the basis of the Sūtrātma according to Yājñavalkya. All that manifests is the expression of the Power of the Divine Being Śiva. Śaṅkara makes it clear by stating that this exists in all times and during origination, continuation, and dissolution, Gārgī was satisfied with the answer and went on to ask the next query.

Her next question is about that which pervades the unmanifest like warp and woof. As Śaṅkara remarks, this is a difficult question to answer. The Unmanifest itself is difficult to explain for it is beyond the concept of space and time. But at least it is the cause. Now the question is about that which surpasses the concept of causation. If the answer be that it is inexplicable, Gārgī can charge him with ignorance (अज्ञानमिति). On the other hand if he explains the inexplicable he can be charged with mis-apprehension (मिश्रमिति). Hence Gārgī considers this question unanswerable.

Avoiding both the pitfalls Yājñavalkya answers in the words of the wise. Since he is not explaining it, he cannot be charged with mis-apprehension and since he is quoting the wise he cannot be charged with ignorance. Paramātmā, the imperishable (अमर) is what pervades even the unmanifest. Śakti is contained in Śiva. This supremely Real is neither gross, nor subtle, is beyond all measurements, matter, quality, senses, mind or sense of inside and outside. It is that which is beyond all attributes. Śaṅkara points out that the very effort of denying so many adjectives implies the existence of Reality. In spite of it Yājñavalkya gives proof of its existence to make it explicit even to the dull-witted. Gārgī points out that all that exists is experienced with attributes. Hence it is natural to presume that the attributeless does

not exist. Most of the later thinkers including Vaiṣṇavas have given this very argument. Yājñavalkya foresaw it and hence went out of his way to rationally demonstrate the existence of the attributeless Reality. In a beautiful summing up Giri points out that world-causation is the indicator of the Supreme in the second sūtra, of Śāṅkara-mīmāṃsā and that Badarayana got his cue from this passage of Yājñavalkya. Giri also gives a number of technical logical syllogisms to prove it.

Basically orderliness of the universe is considered here as the indicator of the inference of the Supreme. The guidance of a conscious transcendent is necessary to maintain regularity in the universe. The Supreme is supremely independent, but everything else depends upon Him. Since his creation is so great and those controlling it so wise and powerful, he is much more so than them. Thus he is wisdom and power itself, whose association makes them wise and powerful.

The Āchārya points out that a thing having parts is bound to be tending towards disintegration by disassociation of the parts. Since things are not disintegrating, we have to presume a principle which is immutable, who not only keeps things integrated but keeps them separate and within their limit. Nothing and none can transgress His rule. His rule extends even to seconds, minutes etc. i.e., time. Similarly moral conduct or charity does not yield to any results in this world still people practise it even by suffering. Such moral persons are praised even by those who are well versed in the field of scriptures, inference, science etc. Such praise implies the fructification of morality in a future existence. The Supreme Being alone can guarantee such fructification. These arguments, specially of the integrating principle are important for generally to ordain dispassion the momentariness of objects is emphasised by Śāṅkara leading at times for an undiscerning eye to see an identity of approach between Vedānta and Buddhism. But in Vedānta the concept of the Supreme Reality as a positive principle is super-most.

There is close inter relation in the way we prove God and the way we conceive Him. The kind of evidence to which we appeal for our conviction of the existence of the Supreme Reality reflects our conception of it, what we mean by it. Śāṅkara observes that the Supreme Reality is beyond reason, but is not un-reasonable. Proofs do not produce religious faith, but they clarify and interpret the already existing faith. Faith in the divine seeks to understand itself through logic. Argument from design, teleology, to use a technical word, is advocacy of a purposive world-outlook. Being a person is being a physical frame, but it does not explain the principle of free choice felt by all of us. This intelligent directive purpose perceived in ourselves makes us feel its presence in the whole of nature. The order and harmony of creation can make sense only if a directive intelligence is at the centre of it all. Thus the commentator is not an illusionist or an idealist as ordinarily conceived. He makes this a proof of the Supreme and there by is in line with the thinkers who respect and work for order and harmony. He was not one of those who could accept that by mere chipping, a great statue could be made, or that six monkeys sitting at six typewriters could type off the Hamlet. Even non-intelligent objects seem to be directed by a rational plan. Śāṅkara goes a step further and claims that the existence of plans itself needs a planner. Without being blind to this world-design and world purpose we can not reject a conscious Being directing and maintaining the whole creation. Even Marx accepted a historical development leading to world-wide Communism. So did Buddha and Maṇavīra accept a moral order. But they seem to accept leading without a leader, or an order without an orderer. This is blind faith. The important thing to be noted here is that whereas the western theologians and Philosophers accepted only a futuristic purpose, Śāṅkara in the tradition of Vedānta accepted, also a present purpose, the

integration principle. Leibniz perhaps comes closest to him in this. He talks of 'pre-established harmony' a 'cooperative nature', 'a symphonic order of many instruments playing together.' Following him Shaftesbury advocates cosmic harmony. But we must remember that Śaṅkara preceded them by a millenium and we must note that he is free from sentimentalism associated with these thinkers specially because following the Christian theology they regard man as the central concern of the Divinity. To Śaṅkara the whole purpose of the world is to provide a physical basis for the manifestation of the Cosmic Being. Since He is Śiva by nature, the conviction of optimism for the good prevailing over the evil is sustained. This follows the moral ground which Śaṅkara covers in this context. He sees Śiva as the cosmic guarantor of the spiritual ideal.

The juridical version or the argument from cosmic justice is the first argument of the moral law within each of us. Recognition of causality in nature, and moral consequences in human life follow from this argument. Both are included in the concept of karma in Hinduism, Buddhism and Jainism. This often confuses the Western reader of Hindu scriptures, reared as he is in dividing the two concept. Thus many of the 'sins' enumerated in Hinduism are merely aberration of social norms or physical and psychological laws. Others of course relate to moral order. Purity and cleanliness are so mixed that it becomes a herculean task to sieve them. The concept of a cosmic Judge forces us to accept either a heaven and a hell or transmigrat ion, for justice does not seem to be happening in many cases. But Śaṅkara in this context uses a more philosophical moral retribution. A virtuous life is worthwhile itself as much as the vicious life is itself evil and ruin. Morality is not good because it brings desirable results, but has a value of its own. 'The wise praise such a one' is only a way of saying that a morally wise acts morally, independent of its results. This is the highest morality and Prabhakara worked it out in detail. But since an average person is incapable of accepting it, retributive morality is the one often spoken of. A virtuous person like Yudhiṣṭhira may suffer poverty and banishment but he still is the virtuous Dharmarāja and is honoured by the wise as such. A vicious person like Duryodhana may enjoy with impurity his ill-gotten gains but he is still a vicious person and is condemned as such by them. Thus Śaṅkara points out that joys or sorrows do not decide moral destiny. But at the same time he is convinced that this pure dutiful devotion to moral virtue deserves happiness. Thus no matter how delayed the justice, [Yudhiṣṭhira does win and Duryodhana does lose. In the cosmic pattern and on a cosmic time-scale virtue and happiness are harmonised, though they may not seem to be in perfect harmony on an individual fragmented pattern and time-scale. Thus Śaṅkara infers the cosmic conscious planner empirically from the world of experience. He is the basis of certain aspects of nature, intelligent order and design, moral pursuit and realisation of values as well as the casual necessity. In the finite perfection of our nature is revealed the infinite perfection of Śiva. This passage to the infinite from the finite is the way in which thought expresses its essential course. Its rejection will imply rejection of thought itself. The upward spring of the mind implies the Upward Being. To say or feel that a thought is better or worthier because it is more coherent or integral or logical implies that the being which is more coherent, integral or orderly is more perfect and more valuable. Brahman is only another name of the Limitless Perfection. His infinitude is unique for it involves the unity of meaning and being (शिव and सत्),

Yājñavalkya goes on to suggest another dimension of the proof of the Divine Being. He says that whoever without the wisdom of this Being performs sacrifice, prayer, worship, austerities etc. will attain but meagre and temporary results, and he will be pitiable at the moment of his death. On the contrary the one who has the wisdom of this Being becomes a Brāhmaṇa. As Śaṅkara observes, this is another rational argument in support of the existence

of the Supreme Being. It is called the pragmatic argument. Its ignorance leads to bondage (बन्ध), and knowledge to liberation. Since no other mode is available for liberation except this wisdom the essential mark of a true idea viz. workability is present here. Basically an idea makes certain demands on experience, and if experience honours and fulfils these demands, it is certainly true. I see a car moving at a distance. The idea of a car if it refers to a true car will demand certain experiences like increase in size, the sound of a horn, whizzing away, passing etc. If these experiences follow, the idea referred to is a true object. The conviction of a Divine Being grips the believer and moulds his entire life. The world is no more the same to him. It becomes His manifestation, a conscious communication from Him. This brings him effectively to terms with life, organises his energy into moral actions, integrates him individually and socially. A man with faith is no more a shattered and futile person. If the idea did not refer to a true Being these results would not have followed. This may not bring a metaphysical certainty but it certainly creates a will or a right to believe. The resolution is needed to sway the doubtful causes into certainty. Truth of the belief in Śiva is urged on the basis of its practical-moral workability. The idea is that even if reason is incapable of settling the issue, the practical life needs a decision. If undecided an infinite chaos is staring at us. Every decision will have to be taken in the dark or will have to wait for infinity. But if we cast the dice on either side all our decisions become meaningful and no decision need wait. It is true that it is at the end of the tunnel of time that we will know the winner, but it is better than to be in suspense for eternity. Vāsudeva points out that a doubting tone is bound to lose both the worlds. A neutral course is not open. Either you live as if the Divine moral order exists or as if it does not. If it does, you cross the bridge of this life as a Brāhmaṇa, if it does not, you still remain a Brāhmaṇa. But if you live as if the Divine moral order does not exist, and it *does*, you pass over it as pitiable, and even if does not it, you still are pitiable like the rest. This implies also a view of *realizing* the Divine. Śiva is the supreme consummation of spiritual values. Our co-wariorship with Him is an inspiring idea. Even if the Divine moral order is non-existent, we can bring this about. Even when a thing is not proved it can be materialised. Of course this is not the line of thought advocated by Śaṅkara. But a mīmāṃsaka like Prabhākara and Pārthasārathi can very well take up this position, for for them Dharma or the goal of life is to be *produced* and not a *settled fact* like Brahman is to the Āchārya.

No argument in itself is final. This is pointed out in the commentary by postulating that the 'nature' of the Sāṅkhyas may be considered as an alternative. But Yājñavalkya answers back authoritatively that 'the imperishable is the unseen yet seer, unheard yet hearer, unknown yet knower; there is no one else who is seer, thinker or knower except Him; the unmanifest or śakti is woven like warp and woof by the Imperishable or Śiva. Thus Yājñavalkya indicates that though every argument can be refuted yet a strain or direction of truth is the total picture obtained by synthesising them all. If some formulations are more logical they are irrelevant in postulating a religious-worshipful idea of the Reality. If some are clear about this postulation, they are not so logical. But a thoughtful believer is more confident of his faith after the enquiry than before it. The arguments based upon causation, design, purpose, morality etc. can each be unsettled in detail, but that does not disprove His reality. The truth often is real and convincing in spite of specific arguments being inconclusive. Any historian or a judge knows this well enough. While sifting and weaving of evidence, it is not the adequate strength of each particular strand that is the deciding factor, but the integral solidity of the texture that yields the true explanation. Wisdom consists in deciphering the contribution of the strength that is to be expected from a particular strand of reasoning. The

architectural character of the structure of truth is important. In modern physics various models are tried out and the one most suitable is accepted. In this we find that the evidence as called by the great master assures the reality of the structure of Being rather than that of non-Being, the convergent probability is towards a Universal consciousness. There is no *specific* proof, but the tendency of all of them sustaining and confirming each other. And that is why Śaṅkara does not mention a *single* proof but enumerates them.

There are some who do not want to take a risk. They would rather remain in suspense than to err. But let us analyse, what is an error? Error is the failure to consider all the relevant facts. Thus it presumes a more inclusive and balanced wisdom. In reference to this wisdom a judgement may be called an error. That wisdom presumes a wise who is sovereign in wisdom. Thus either there is nothing that can be called an error or there is a conscious being who possesses the infinite unity of wisdom in having all possible truth. Thus to remain in suspense itself implies an all knowing centre of truth. This reasoning has been covered by Śaṅkara in the Sūtra-Bhāṣya. Frankly the atheistic rejection of the ultimate spiritually Real makes reason itself meaningless. It may not be logically demonstrable that the cosmic conscious Being really exists, but its unreality, equally undemonstrable, leads to existence itself becoming senseless. Śiva may be incomprehensible but nothing else is comprehensible without His reality. Śiva is the centre or cornerstone of rational moral experience and its ultimate implications. All this has been discussed leaving out the personal testimony of Yājñavalkya. Śaṅkara and a host of others all over the world accept that a spiritual Ultimate has been experienced by them. Thus it is clear that for Yājñavalkya the attributeless ultimate reality is not a concept but a precept. He presents it in a logical way to convince the wavering soul that Śiva is the Ultimate beyond, present in all the faculties of nature and psyche.

Gargī bowed out requesting the other wise ones to do the same. Śaṅkara points out that the same Supreme Reality is called differently due to differing adjuncts. In itself being beyond name and form it is called 'not this'. Associated with body and ignorance it is called 'jīva' the individual. Associated with infinite knowledge and power it is the inner controller. The commentary repudiates certain sectarian views like: the inner controller is the slightly agitated state of the Being which is like an ocean; the individual is the extremely agitated state of the same Being who does not know the internal ruler. Some conceive of eight states viz., Undifferentiate, witness, individual, individualised self, species, virāt, sūtratmā and controller. Some consider these as powers. Still others as the modifications. But all these are against the rational approach that a thing can not be really both afflicted and unafflicted at the same time. Thus unaffliction is the real and all others illusory. The seeming difference is due to adjuncts. Intrinsically there is neither diversity nor unity, for it is Pure consciousness as Hiraṇya garbha, Unmanifest, gods, species, individuals, men, animals, spirits etc., but remains Pure all the time. Thus ends the main topic of this chapter.

ŚAKALYA BRĀHMAṆA

Now the immediacy and directness of the Absolute is being conveyed by mentioning contraction and expansion of different gods who are ruled by It. The contraction ends with vitality and expansion with infinity as pointed out in the Nyāyanirṇaya. Śakalya was a priest and so his questions relate mostly to the ritualistic section. In the earlier section of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa it has been stated that Yājñavalkya had warned in the knowledge of the Absolute and that if he so indulged, harm would follow. In spite of this admonition he indulged in this assembly even after being alerted by Gārgī. Eventually Yājñavalkya asks him whether he knows anything about the All Pervasive Real present within, and since Śakalya knew nothing

about It he was destroyed, indicating that one ought not argue about the Supreme without being dedicated to Its search.

Śākalya questioned about the number of gods. According to Sayana gods are different powers of one Maheśwara. Since his power is infinite, it is only for the sake of convenience that categorisation is indulged into. Hence one cannot talk of any specific number as the final or real. So Yājñavalkya categorised them as it is done in the Nivid section of Vaiśvadeva chapter. The number mentioned there is three thousand three hundred and six (thirty three thousand three hundred and three). They can be regrouped in to thirty three, who can be regrouped into six. These six can be reduced to three, who are actually two. The two are one and a half, but they again can be reduced to just one. All the gods are the powers of one Mahadeva.

Thirty three are the important and meaningfully real categories. The eight Vasūs, eleven Rudras, twelve Ādityas, Indra and Prajāpati are the thirty three. As Śaṅkara points out the *Vasus* transform themselves into bodies and organs of all beings which serve as the support for their work and its fruition, as also into their dwelling places. Vasūs are so named for they help others to live, apart from living themselves. The eleven *Rudras* are the five senses of knowing, five organs of action and the internal sense organ i. e., the mind. In short the transmigrating adjunct or the individual self is the Rudra. They are so named because they cause weeping on departing from the mortal body. The twelve months are the *Ādityas*. Time is the element meant here. Ādityas are so named because they move carrying along all this. Śaṅkara makes clear that months are only manifested parts of the eternal time and they move indicating the exhaustion of a man's sojourn on this earth by the exhaustion of the fructified karma. *Indra* is the strength or thunderbolt that strikes to kill. *Prajāpati* is the sacrifice or really the means to sacrifice. Actually yajamāna or the individual self (jīva or chidābhāsa) is the animal mentioned here.

These thirty three may be included in six. According to later tradition Dyu is Śiva, Āditya is Nārāyaṇa, Antarikṣa is Kārtikeya, Vāyu is Durgā, Pṛthvi is Gaṇeśa, and Agni is Sūrya. Thus the six sects of later Hinduism are postulated here.

Three include the six. Agni, Vāyu and Āditya are the three deities meant. Śakti, Śiva and Nārāyaṇa in the paurāṇika tradition are the corresponding three.

Matter and life are the two deities out of which all evolve. Puruṣa and Prakṛti or consciousness and the unmanifest are the two deities. Nārāyaṇa as the ground or material cause, and Pārvatī as the directive or efficient cause are the corresponding gods of later Hinduism.

Śiva or Saguṇa Brhman is the one and a half. Vāyu is its external form and animation (प्राण) is its internal form. Since its presence causes everything to grow it is called one and a half. Ignorance creates the infinite illusion in the presence of knowledge, thus ignorance associated with knowledge (अज्ञानविशिष्टब्रह्म, द्र० अद्वैतरत्नरक्षणम्, पृ० ४३) is the cause of all growth.

Brahman or nirguṇa Śiva is the one who is the substratum of all the deities. Life or vitality is its symbol. As Śaṅkara says Brahman is the inner being of all the gods. He is called Tyat i. e., the one who can never be described directly by a word. It is concluded that this is the unity and the infinite variety of gods. Brahman expands into different numbers upto infinity. It is It alone which appears as having different names, forms, activities, attributes and powers. Giri points out that since the words hundred and thousand refer to infinite numbers, the Nivid enumeration includes infinite varieties. He further points out that since people differ in

their capacity for meditation and action, and since they further differ in their aptitudes, likes and dislikes, the Supreme Lord makes Himself manifest in various names, forms etc. Performing meditations, rites and conducts most suited to them they acquire various stages of mental culture reaching the unity with a particular deity who is part of the Sūtratma. Thus diversity is the grace of Śiva, rather than an attempt to confuse, as understood by the dull-witted.

It is in this spirit that Vyāsa, Śaṅkara and others traced the entire scale of belief and worship from naturistic polytheism to mystic monotheism and pantheism. Vedic prayers are addressed to this Supreme Reality that animates in every natural and human object as well as the very being of the subject and his manifestation in the gross and subtle body. Indra, Rudra, Agni, Varuṇa, Mitra, Rta, Sūrya, Viṣṇu, Vāyu, Parjanya etc. are just a few of them. Reading the prayers one finds that everyone of them is extolled as the highest and similar adjectives are used for them all. In later Paurāṇika, Āgamika and hymnal literature we find the same tendency. A thousand names of each deity regularly use the names of the other important deities. Āvarāṇa devatās of any deity include all others. If one does not compare the other passages one might tend to feel that very aspect is the Supreme. This led in the last one and a half millennium many sects to rise. Each one has passages if not in the Veda, at least in the Purāṇas and Āgamas to support his contention that the particular sectarian deity is the creator and lord of all, and none is equal to him. But a review of other sections or similar literature convince that the deity is an aspect of the Supremely Real non differentiated Absolute. Different stotras of Śaṅkara Bhagavad are bound to convince any one that devotion was absolute to the particular manifestation only because it was a manifestation of the Supreme, and not because there was anything specially supreme in the particular manifestation. Many modern sectarians have tried to prove that the great master was a Śakta or a Vaiṣṇava. But the fact is he was both and yet untouched by both in a sectarian way.

Though Max Muller has coined a term henotheism for Vedic devotion thinking that the Vedic seers admitted the existence of several limited independent gods, any one of whom could be conceived at a given moment by a given devotee as the Supreme, since the idea of one Supreme Ruler was present, yet he shows either ignorance or misjudgement of the fact that the Veda does *not* support the idea of independent deities but is absolutely monotheist in accepting the nameless and formless Supreme Absolute, whose power is manifested in the dependent deities. At a given moment the Supreme in a particular adjunct is considered as the object of worship, hence the confusion. Since the Vedic seers were clear about this, they never tried to neglect or suppress any of the deities as Ikhnaton and others tried, nor did they look down upon any deity, as the Hebrew or Arabic tradition of monotheism tried to do. It is true that later Vaiṣṇava traditions did try this monotheism, but that was much later and it never could become the Sanatāna Dharma, and remained a sectarian movement. The main stream continued to hold that at the back of all the Gods, is the one ultimate divine Real. 'Tat' here refers to that Real. That Real is also the inmost heart and core of man's being, the soul of his soul. The highest wisdom is this identity and the highest worship, intense meditation on this Unity. Thus Hinduism sets the ideal of perceiving the infinite reality of the cosmic Being as identical with the purest self of the individual being, to recognize one in all, the eternal unity through all the vicissitudes of the individual existence. Philosophy grasps and solves the problems that arise on critical analysis of this mystic conviction. But the conviction born out of experience is to be explained, not denied. Thus Hinduism has a personality all its own, and its monotheism is a philosophical monism and poetic theism, rather than an emotional prophetic monotheism of the semitic races.

Śākalya goes on to the next question where eight forms of Brahman are discussed in detail. Each form has its own abode, the means of perceiving it, its enlightener and its deity. Each form is the ultimate resort of the body and organs in its own way. In each case Śākalya describes all other parts leaving out the deity and Yājñavalkya supplies it. Śaṅkara points out that in this section the deity is that from which all the aspects emanate. All these eight forms and parts are for the purpose of meditation as pointed out in the Nyāyanirṇaya. In later Āgamika literature eight aspects are quite common for meditation. Each part has a universal aspect, an individual aspect and their emanator. The object of meditation is the same. Colours are mentioned twice suggesting that Yājñavalkya knew about the two aspects of colours viz, colour of the object and colour perceived in the eye.

Śākalya further describes the pentad meditation of the same Supreme Being. It shows Him divided into five directions unified in the heart. Yājñavalkya challenged Śākalya in no uncertain terms that if he continued in this fashion he was nearing his own end. But as if directed by the devil Śākalya continued in the same fashion. Each direction is associated with a specific deity, its support which in each case sublimates into intellectual emotional centre, called here, the heart. At the end Śākalya goes on to question the unquestionable, the support of the heart. Already in Gārgī's case Yājñavalkya had pointed out not to question logically what is known through the scriptures or mystic vision, lest the evil may befall the questioner. Śākalya falls into the same pit and comes to the inevitable end.

Śaṅkara points out a deep mystery. Śākalya knew that Yājñavalkya had a realisation of his own self as the all pervading direction. Through this symbol he had attained the identification with the whole universe as his own self. Thus this was his Iṣṭa or chosen deity. Śākalya tried to make fun of it by asking the support of the heart. This was too much for Yājñavalkya. Under no circumstances should one question the mystic vision and the mystic symbol of an individual. Āgamika tradition emphasises the secrecy of one's incantation (मन्त्र) and chosen deity (इष्ट). Some traditions specially forbid initiating a disciple into one's own incantation and deity. The main idea is that faith should not be questioned. The fact that Śākalya asks a personal question, 'What deity are you?', rather than 'What is the deity?' indicates that Śākalya tried to insult Yājñavalkya in this fashion. It was this which enraged Yājñavalkya and brought about the death of Śākalya. Śaṅkara observes that everywhere in the Vedas it is stated that in this very life one becomes identified with the specific form of the deity that one meditates upon. Giri points out that the great Muni had attained the identification with the whole universe through the symbol of the heart. He also raises the question that only after death viz., disassociation with the body, the identification with the deity of the direction should be possible, since two associations are not possible. The answer is simple. If the associations were real, it would not have been possible. Since they are only superimposed, unreal, there is no defect. And the Veda clearly states that the identification is possible in this very life while living in the body.

The commentator explains that form is in the heart in the shape of past impressions. No form can be recognised as such without a previous impression. Hence the external universe is always 'observed' in terms of what impressions have been made. Coordinates of the subject determines the object. Each object has infinite dimensions or faces and it is the observer who determines the particular face of the object which is observed. Vedānta does not deny the objective reality, but emphasises the independence or choice-factor of the subject. This sometimes looks like an idealist view, and at times Vedānta has been condemned as Buddhism in disguise, but that is because the whole concept is not properly understood by the critics. Vedānta accepts

the subjective choice of the particular aspect of an object at the moment of observation, *without* denying that the object *has* infinite phases. Actually it is the consciousness of Śiva which is appearing to us as an object, for our consciousness is but a reflection of His consciousness. Since He is infinite, His consciousness is infinite, hence His message is infinite. Our limited being, the body-mind-complex can take in only the infinitesimal of that message. Hence our knowledge is limited. We know only one phase in space time causation of the whole object. Thus the picture which we form is limited by our own impressions. Therefore objective knowledge is said to be existing in the heart. Thus, Śaṅkara observes, the heart begins or creates the forms, and as such it can be said that the heart is transmuted into them.

Discussing the connection between the South and Yama Śaṅkara points out that the sacrifice is accomplished by the priests, and bought over by the sacrificer from them by paying the fee. Thus he obtains the southern heaven (दक्षिणायनम्) along with its ruler Yama. Śraddhā in this context is defined as the desire to give with devotion to Maheśvara and with certitude about its result. The fee is the result of Śraddhā, hence without Śraddhā if it be paid, it cannot bear fruit. One is to remember that the Taittirīya Upaniṣad lays down that one ought not to donate without Śraddhā. And this Śraddhā is but a manifestation of the heart, for it alone knows Śraddhā. Modification is always in the one who modifies. Thus we find the clear commentary on the famous passage of the Veda that fee and faith are interrelated. The North and Soma are associated because both the Soma vine and Soma deity (Umā-Maheśvara) are found in the north. Śaṅkara clearly points out that since mere Soma-worship (सोमयज्ञ) being an action can never take one to the northern heaven (उत्तरायनम्), the meditation on the deity is implied by the word initiation (दीक्षा). The initiate is bound to stick to truth. False speaking makes initiation invalid. The truth is known by the heart.

Śaṅkara Bhagavad postulates that by identifying with the heart Yājñavalkya has become all name, form and action. Not only the seen, but the unseen is also identified with the heart for the rites leading to the Southern heaven, and the rites associated with meditation leading to the Northern heaven have also been included. Thus all the universe and speech (Veda) are modification of the heart. Śākalya questions this universal identification when he asks the support of this heart. That which supports this heart is naturally excluded by the heart. It is this allegation that infuriates Yājñavalkya for the heart is his window to the infinite. The heart is at the moment in the body else one would be dead, but the body being a part of the universe is really in the heart. This identification or superimposition is what keeps the body alive. There is a clear suggestion of inter-imposition (अन्योन्याध्यास) here. The body is materially or really super-imposed on the heart along with the connection between the two being super-imposed. The heart, though is not materially super-imposed, being true itself. Only its association with the body is super-imposed. Thus though the heart rests in the body it is neither limited nor illusory. The editor points out clearly that the form is completely identified with the eastern direction. The name with zenith, the mere action with south, action with progeny with west and action with 'knowledge' with north. Thus the whole universe of name-form-action is identified with the heart.

In spite of Yājñavalkya's warning, Śākalya went on to ask, 'What keeps the body and heart interconnected in spite of the knowledge, or what is the cause of their being thus super-imposed?' Yājñavalkya answered that it is the vital force, the manifestation of the Divine will that causes and maintains it. Śaṅkara points out that the body, mind and the vital forces are interdependent. They work together as an orderly aggregate. They act for the fulfilment of the purpose of the individual self. The transcendent Brahman regulates all these by pervading

them like warp and woof. In the kṛva recension, followed by Śaṅkara Bhagavad, the passage describing the Supreme occurs here which must be read afterwards. So Yājñavalkya now asks Śākalya the ultimate question. He says 'Thus have I described the octads as questioned by you. Now I ask you who is it that projects and withdraws them, remaining untouched by the process. If you have asked me the manifestations without knowing the one who manifests, you shall have to die. This ultimate Real is to be known only by the Upaniṣads.' Śākalya knew it not and thus died an inglorious death, for even the last rites could not be performed in the absence of his mortal remains.

The Upaniṣad described the Supreme Real by referring to the last chapter (2. 3. 6) where it is described as 'not this, not this' beyond all that can be predicated. Giri concludes that the mere vision of Kūṭastha, the substratum of the inner controller of all the universe and externally controlling the heaven and earth as associated with ignorance is the Supreme self within us. Yājñavalkya wanted to demonstrate that Śākalya had no right to question him since he was ignorant even of the fundamental truth.

The Āchārya points out that beyond the attributes of the effect, the Real is incomprehensible. It can be known only by the mystic wisdom. A mystic should be adored and worshipped, for disrespect to him destroys a man in this world and in the next. Moreover those who are not wise should be defeated by the mystic and the fee taken away by him is being ordained. This indicates that those who are merely learned of the words of the Veda should take a secondary place where the mystic is present and should offer all their possessions to him. It is due to the mystery that the words, charity, conduct, austerity etc. have any meaning. Since the mystic and Real are one, the mystic must be given honour due to the Real Himself. The later purāṇas maintain the same spirit by stating that a devotee is a symbol worthy of the same honour as the lord.

Yājñavalkya challenged all those present but none of them took it up. Then he asked them the root cause of the universe, comparing it to a tree. Hindu tradition has often compared the universe to a tree; a river or an ocean. Actually man here is compared to the tree, and Yājñavalkya asks that a tree when cut rises again from its root, what is that root from which man rises? He also says that a tree when uprooted does not rise again. So the seed or semen which give rise to another tree is not the answer. The Brahmanas present there had no answer, and so Yājñavalkya took away the cows.

Having finished the story the Upaniṣad goes on to describe the root of man in her own words. Pure intelligence, Bliss, Spontaneous, Ever content, Śiva is the root from which the universe springs. Śiva is also the bestower of the desired results to those who perform rituals. Śiva is the dispenser of wealth. He is the supreme goal of the wise who live in him renouncing all desires and rituals. He is the end and beginning of the whole universe.

The concept of Bliss as regards the Supreme Real is discussed. In Dharmamīmāṃsā while deciding the meaning of the incantations it has been proved that the meaning of words in the Veda is the same as in everyday usage. Hence bliss should also mean cognised joy as it is the usage in sentences like 'it was bliss to be on the hills.' But then, other texts reveal that in Brahman one does not cognise anything apart from its own being. Thus bliss refers to the state of cognition which is denied in Brahman. Hence the true import of the mystic state revealed in the Veda must be determined. Added to this is the fact that Kapila and Kaṇāda along with the Buddha do not accept bliss being cognised in the state of liberation,

while the Vedāntins accept Infinite bliss cognised as non-different from the self-evident witness. Of course there are other mystics who accept the object as full of bliss, and the individual self tasting it as an object. Hence a discussion is necessary. The obvious answer of the faithful will be that we must accept what the Veda reveals. The bliss can be only a cognised bliss, and if can not be cognised it will not be bliss. So even though it may sound impossible we must accept it on the authority of revelation. Śaṅkara declared that scriptures being of a revealing nature can not transform: they cannot make fire cold. It can not be asserted that in some other country fire may be cold. Thus he is affirmative that revelation can not assert that which is contradicted by direct or inferential knowledge. It can only supplement the knowledge. The answer may lie in that the experience 'I am happy' is direct. Similarly Brahman knows itself to be bliss. He asserts that the analogy does not hold true for the experience. 'I am happy' relates to the body-mind complex. Liberation is bereft of the body and the mind, and thus experience of this nature can not take place. Moreover such an experience will imply duality of subject and object, which is denied in Brahman. Giri suggests a possibility that even though ordinary knowing is an activity needing duality, the knowledge of liberated bliss is not an activity. But this will imply assertion of an unknown type of knowledge in the Veda. Such an assertion is undesirable, for then any possible meaning can be assigned to a Vedic sentence.

The discussion here touches a vital point. The Nyāyanirṇaya raises three alternatives of knowing bliss: who knows It? The supreme real, the one who has attained It, or the one who is still striving for It. None of these can experience It. The supreme, being nondifferent from bliss, cannot grasp it, for it is something else that one grasps, not one's own self. Similarly the one who has attained It is incapable to make It an object of cognition, and if it is contended that he does cognize It as an object, then surely he is not non-different from It and has thus not attained It. The one who is still striving for It, identifying himself with the material coordinates not sufficient to realise the Absolute, cannot obviously grasp that bliss. The aim of endeavor is achievement. Checked or frustrated achievement is grievous. We want to reach a final stage. Our aim is to worship a Reality which is utterly achieved, beyond limits or problems. Infinite perfection is an inner need, even if the intellect refuses to accept it. All religions insist on perfection as the sign of saintly mystical realisation. The saint cries aloud "I am he whose purpose is fulfilled. Nothing remains unattained. I am Bliss Absolute, the limitless or non-problematic joy". Perfect by definition is that which lacks nothing. Excellence is completion where it lacks no part of its natural magnitude (सकल). Brahman is infinite, eternal bliss. Apart from Hinduism this perfection is not claimed as existing in man while on earth. But Hinduism claims this perfection in the way that the sea remains untainted by a dirty stream. Thus it will not do for a Śāṅkaranist to impute relativism to this bliss. Nor will it suffice like a Buddhist to assert the end of life or self itself in the theory of anatta. It is true that the conviction of our own insufficiency pervades all our activities. It may be true that all our values, truth, beauty, goodness are partial, and thus ultimately unreal, but to assert it we must transcend them in the Absolute which has impartial value, truth, beauty and goodness. The Absolute must be perfect since it is complete, final and All. If there is anything not included in It, that will stand outside It necessarily limiting It, reducing It to finitude. Thus the Absolute absorbs all finite categories and values. Thus Śiva of religion and Brahman of metaphysics fuse into one. Śiva contemplates the moral toil of man as adults regard the intent but inconsequent acts of children. Brahman is the ground in which moral categories are transcended and absorbed. Unless the bonds of all positive and negative values are consu-

mated they no not relieve and perfection, is unattained. But from the standpoint of active perfection, Śiva is the eternally unattained perfection. Value is eternally real only in being inexhaustible, that is in its eternally active perfectability. Achieving, problem-facing, hazzard-ing activity is really perfect. These two stand-points in Vedānta are represented by Śaṅkara and Maṇḍana respectivaly. Later on also there have been two strands : one accepting perfected sainthood (जीवमुक्ति), the other holding to perfecting sainthood (विदेहमुक्ति). The first in more metaphysical and the second, more religious or ethical.

Vedānta came forth as a pre-eminantly spiritual solution to life, thought and emotion. Buddhism depreciated the material world metaphysically and rejected the carnal as expressed in organised monasticism. In its last day materialism took hold of it completely and the mantrāyāna-vajrayāna branch of Māhāyāna was basically a materialistic outlook. The anatta concept was bent backwards to yield to these new aspirations. Vedānta was a critical reaction to this. More adequate examination of the foundations of liberation and its positive aspect of immortality in terms of contentless knowledge and objectless Bliss was undertaken. Since materialism in the contemporary world is behaviouristic-psychology, it comes closest to the later Māhāyāna. According to this, sensation is the root of all conceptions of self. Sensation is a mechanical reaction to outside impressions. The soul is entirely a product of material force, and it grows physically, matures, decays and is annihilated at death. Immortality and liberation in this scheme is out of question. Just as a clock broken strikes no hours, the dead soul has no existence. No spiritual principle or Brahman is needed to understand the soul. Matter in motions explains all. Thinking is the operation of the cerebro-neural system, just as digestion is of the stomach. Cavanis holds that the brain secretes ideas as the islets of Langerhans secrete insulin. Thus the earliest concept of food as Brahman is the position held by these schools of modern thought. Feuerbach declares that man is what he eats (*Der mensch ist was er isst*). To this way of thinking 'immortality is a dogma which is in hopeless contradiction with the most solid empirical truths of modern science.' (Hackel : *the Riddle of the Universe* pg. 210) (*italics mine*).

Vedānta offers a spiritual solution. It grants that thought is a function of the brain, but it is not its product : it is a transmissive function. The brain is a vehicle which the thinking soul uses. It conditions or even limits the thinking, but does not produce it. Thus *anna is Brahms* but the Brahman is not merely *anna*. And this extends to all the five sheaths. Now we see through the medium, then we will see without the medium. To see through the medium is mortal bliss and mortal knowledge, to see without it is immortality (immortal bliss and immortal knowledge). Personality is an organic function, but not merely so, for many fundamental parts of personality require different explanation. For certain purposes man is occupied space, but for other purposes he is also a system of chemical compounds. These two may be different, but not contradictory. If anything, they are supplementary. The concept of truth, virtue, beauty, loyalty, devotion cannot be explained in terms of brain secretions. They must be recognised in a comprehensive view of man. Science in itself is non-scientific for it recognises categories and principles other than the empirical sensuous truths. Can we say that the theory of relativity itself is a secretion ? Is the behaviourists' psychological theory only his pharyngeal audible vibration ? This is the defect of the scientific account of the soul or personality. Hence it is incompetent to judge immortality. The soul is really a progressive unity in the process of self conscious experience. This has an optimistic note in the theism of the Veda, and a pessimistic note in atheism. The atheism of Buddha and Mahāvīra emphasises the doctrine of retribution. Both of them lack definite assurance of salvation. One reaps now what has been sown in a mysterious past, ages ago, and what I sow now may be reaped not only in the

next life but in millions of lives hence. A saintly man may have thousands of painful lives in store for him in expiation of some unremembered past wickedness. And the unspeakable villain may be a saint in his next life in reward for his saintly act in a life hundreds of thousands of years back. Thus immediacy and definite assurance is lacking. Vedānta provides both, immediacy and assurance. Enlightenment of a most radical character can be had here and now. Errors and evils are due to a wrong grasp of reality, and even at this moment one may perceive the wisdom of his true being, the Brahman. This wisdom is not the result of any action, and so it is not retribution or a reward.

But what is the assurance that we can get the wisdom? Śiva's love is the guarantee :

'Light seen mid blooming flowers, the faultless grace Supreme,

Who to his servants grants the boon of justice bright;

The king of virtuous excellence who reigns benign,

In Perum-turrai girt with fragrant flowery grooves—

Himself hath come, and on this earth, a gracious form,

Descending hath revealed the Primal Deity.

That Grace who know with our Supernal Lord are one.'

(Māṇḍūkya XI-III-1)

The very form of Śiva is love. Appaya Dīkṣita confirmed logically that all souls will be redeemed. Śiva's infinite love prevails over all evil. Thus in the relative existence (व्यावहारिक) Śiva's love is the assurance, just as in the absolute sense (पारमार्थिक) the reality itself is the guarantee. Since Śiva's love can be felt here and now the immediacy is also at hand. If all jīvas were not really Śiva, finality of corruption and final defeat of all goodness would have been possible. In any dualism this immediacy and assurance will be lacking. But in the monism of Śaṅkara failure of redemption even for a simple soul will mean metaphysically, Brahman being non-Brahman (ब्रह्मार्थो दुर्लभो यस्माद् द्वितीये सति वस्तुनि), and religiously, the final defeat not only of the soul but also of Śiva. Thus Vedānta provides an answer which the atheist cannot provide and which an aspirant needs most. Immortality thus is one of the most important issues in all spiritual discussion. Bhagavatpāda concludes by referring to bliss eternal as the purport of this passage.

THE FOURTH CHAPTER

The last chapter dealt with the Supreme in a logical way, the way of winning an argument, while, as Giri notes, the present chapter deals with It in a way that a faithful student needs. Śaṅkara informs that this and the following section indicate another method of understanding the same truth which was dealt with in the last section. The story is to teach certain proprieties like, that the wisdom should be taught only to a student full of faith, and that it should only be learnt through a teacher.

Vaideha Janaka was giving an audience to all who wanted to see him. A king giving a public audience is an old custom in India. Every citizen has a right of free approach to his ruler. Listening to the sorrows or miseries suffered by an individual is the bare minimum that a superior senior can do for his juniors or dependents. Modern communications should have made it easier for the powers that be, but in practice this has practically gone out of fashion. Any way that is the Hindu scriptural injunction.

Yājñavalkya came there for gaining some wealth for his university and also to discuss about the Supreme Real. Janaka must have performed the famous sacrifice the Rājāsūya and ruled independently to have been called a samrāt. येनेष्टं राजसूयेन मण्डलस्थेश्वरश्च यः । शास्ति यश्चाज्ञया राज्ञः स सम्राडिति कथ्यते ॥ Śaṅkara gives an alternative meaning that he might have been an emperor of

India. Giri defines India as the land betwixt the Himalaya and the Ocean. Both these possibilities indicate the reason of Yājñavalkya approaching him. Yājñavalkya asks him what he had already learnt from someone else. Janaka informs him of the different symbols of Brahman that he had learnt from Jitwa, Udaṅka, Barku, Gardabhīvipita, Satyakāma and Vidagdha. They taught the vak, parṇa, eye, mind and heart respectively. In each case Yājñavalkya appreciated the teacher but supplemented the teachings by indicting its different sections. Yājñavalkya says that the teachers were correct for they had learn from all the three, the mother, the father and the guru. Śaṅkara Bhagawad makes it clear that the mother must be able to teach her child properly. This clearly indicates that mothers in ancient India were learned. Moreover they all were such that they never taught what was not authoritative. But none of the scholars taught Janaka the abode, ether, and what it symbolised. Yājñavalkya taught all of it when questioned by Janaka. But each time when the fee was offered Yājñavalkya refused it by saying that his father did not permit him to accept any fee without completely satisfying the student. Eventually Janaka realised that all the specific forms of Brahman that he knew were known by Yājñavalkya in a fuller measure. Thus the obstacle to his discipleship, i. e. arrogance of being a learned one was removed. He got down from his chair and prostrated to Yājñavalkya and asked for instruction. This sets up the tradition that a student must prostrate and ask for instructions. Yājñavalkya questioned Janaka if he knew in spite of his learning of the Veda, Upaniṣad and secret knowledge of Brahman, his destination after death. Janaka expressed his ignorance. Yājñavalkya taught him the knowledge of Brahman that makes a person fearless. This question of Yājñavalkya is important for it brings Vedānta closer to life. Often enough transmigration is the *raison d'être* of wisdom, but here Yājñavalkya refers not to an abstract transmigration but a direct question. He thus sets forth the tradition that a Vedantin should always put before himself the real problem rather than expound a hypothetical problem. Real problems are enough for mankind, making their increase undesirable burden by postulating hypothetical ones.

SECTION ON THE THREE STATES

The next section deals with an episode which is mentioned in the earlier sections of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa. Once Janaka taught certain secrets of Angihotra to Yājñavalkya who promised to answer any question later on. Now Yājñavalkya after having taught Janaka the secret of the soul as the enjoyer and enjoyed decided not to discuss anything with Janaka. But reminding him of his earlier promise, Janaka wanted to learn from him logical reasoning in support of the teaching which he had given in brief through the scriptural passage. Thus the discussions of these states of consciousness are only a rational explanation of the previous section. Śaṅkarāchārya is clear that Yājñavalkya went to the king for collection and maintenance of funds for his university. He makes a clear statement that the earlier section of the Satapatha did not deal with wisdom, to make it explicit that wisdom and action are in contradiction to each other. Knowledge is the independent cause of liberation. There have been three views of the connection betwixt action and wisdom. Some hold them worthy of practice simultaneously. Others hold that they are unconnected. Still others regard them as cause and effect. Vāsudeva Kṛṣṇa and Śaṅkara hold the last view. Action done without attachment purifies the intellect and makes available the proper environment and guru for the aspirant to attain wisdom. But liberation is attained by wisdom unattended by the results of any action, physical or mental.

The Bhāṣya raises another interesting aside. The question asked by Janaka implies a very sharp intellect. Such being the case why does he not decide the issue himself? Bhagawa-

tpāda answers that the connection between the different parts of inference like the smoke with fire is very difficult even in the visible universe to comprehend. It is much more so in subtle matters like the present one. Even a number of wise persons find it difficult to come to a conclusion, let alone a single individual. Hence the law-books lay down the procedure of a seminar to decide such matters. Moreover the particular individuals who decide are all of different caliber. Some are merely knowers of the Veda, others are merely learned in spiritual matters, still others are equipped with both. The best seminar consists of ten persons : those learned in the Ṛg, Yaju, Sāma, sementics, logic, metaphysics, religious texts, and also a grha-stha, a Vānaprastha and a Sannyāsi. Thus Śaṅkara tells us the democratic and open minded attitude towards religious matters as the Vadika view, as compared to the dogmatic view of the sectarians all over the world. Hinduism from the earliest times depended on the accumulated and convergent knowledge of the *wise ones* of the particular time to decide the issue. But only those who have already mastered different branches are to form the board. The present trend of the law-makers, who know nothing of the scriptures and the wisdom contained in it to decide the religious issue in the name of reform has no scriptural sanction. But at the same time the sectarian attitude of orthodoxy is equally non-Hindu.

The question relates to that light which is extraneous to the body-mind complex, which is ever present in all the three states of consciousness. This light is the Self which illumines them, but is not illumined by anything else, and so is w. f. all of them. The materialist may object that only a material light can help a material object which the body etc. undoubtedly are. The experience of all is that the eye that sees the body is part of the body, hence that which lightens need not necessarily be different from the lighted. Thus the body mind complex is itself the self. Just as a fire-fly is both luminous and non-luminous, the body mind complex at times acts and at other times is non-active. But dream and memory give a lie to the materialist. With which light will a blind person see, i.e., remember his past visions ? Similarly with what light will a dreamer see the dream objects when the eyes are shut ? If any other organ is so presumed why does it see only the seen object and no new objects. Moreover to remember, one closes his eyes. So the one who shuts, the eyes and who remembers are the self and not the eyes which are supposed to be seers by the materialist. Remembrance and experience must be in the same location even according to materialist. His argument that only things belonging to a similar class can help to illuminate them is also invalid for though fire is lighted by earth, it is also lighted by water as in lightening. The absence of light in a dead body also proves that light is different from the body. The fire-fly glows in parts because of contraction of wings, and not because it is naturally both. Inference cannot be denied as a means of knowledge else hunger will not induce a man to eat. A materialist cannot suggest virtue and vice as the cause of seeing and not seeing at different times because virtue etc. are not recognised by him. But even after the self-light is proved to be internal and extraneous to the body-mind complex, the nature of it is not clear. Though it seems to be of the nature of knowledge it appears so only because the discrimination between the limiting adjunct or the intellect is not experienced. Actually the self does not think, but witnesses the act of thought. Thought and action do not belong to the real nature of the self. Because of this association it seems limited. A wise one has terminated this association.

The commentator like a modern sementician asserts that the meaning of a word is to be determined by its use in a passage of definite import. The meaning of a word should not vitiate it against its use in a similar passage. Thus the vijñānamaya case does not mean a modification of consciousness as held by Bhartṛprapañcha because in the passages of manomaya

etc., they accept the meaning of 'maya' as different from modification. Since the Mādhyandina recension uses the word 'Sadhīh (with the intellect), and the Kāṇva Mādhyandina both use 'Hṛdi' (in the intellect) it is clear that association with intellect is being definitely told rather than the intellect being a modification of consciousness. Intellect is a transparent and the closest adjunct of the self. Hence it catches the luminosity of the self and acts as if it was itself luminous. Even learned people confuse the two because of their proximity during all the activities. The mind reflects the intellect-associated-self, the organs reflect the mind-associated-intellect-associated self, and lastly the body reflects this reflection. Thus successively it is the self that illuminates everything in the body mind complex. Thus the ignorant identify this complex with the self. But it is for this self that the complex exists and functions. Since this cannot be physically taken apart and shown, the world is deluded. Only a discriminative wisdom can grasp it thoroughly. To make it clear the experience of dream is to be analysed. But to make the conception clear two states, of being in this world and being out of this world are mentioned, and sleep is the intermediary state. Saṅkara defines this world as the present body which is experienced in the sensation of the body, the senses and the objects. The 'out of this world' refers to that which is out of this body etc. Since sleep is also out of this body why is it not considered as such? He replies that the continuation of memory of this body etc. is the reason that it is not so considered. Similarly the memory of the other world as expressed in the experiences not experienced in this world is the reason why it cannot be considered in this body. Thus it is the intermediary point from where both are remembered. Just as, as the result of sin (i. e. virtue and vice) one gets born here, so, as the result of the exhaustion of it one dies here to be associated with another body mind complex. This succession continues until one gets liberated. The word used here as the cause of birth is 'sin'. In many other passages both in the Veda and the Purāṇas this word is used in a similar context. It needs a little explanation specially because Christianity has taken up this concept seriously and developed it as a complete philosophy.

Psychology analyses religious experience and reveals its complex motivation and expression. Perplexity and faith, awe and hope, a grievous sense of need and living devotion, search for truth and meaninglessness of the manifest universe contend and at times mix with each other. In worship, adoration, meditation, sacrifice etc. is expressed the sublime reach upwards to the infinite. But there is also a helpless cry from the depths in manifesting love to creatures which is a part of religious ethics. There is conviction of reality of the highest value of religion, but equal realisation that evil is irreducible. This leads to anguish and even self revulsion. There is not only a conflict but there are phases in a complex experience of conflict in resolution. Looking at the body-mind complex the sense of unworthiness overpowers, but looking at his reality, Śiva, the sense of eternal purity over shadows it. I as I am worthless, but I as Śiva am supremely worthy. And this is the secret that forces an aspirant to accept Divine Grace.

There are two distinct views of human nature. One adheres to the view that willfully we sin and willfully a development and perfection of character is chiselled out of this sinful life. Vices are really defects or failures having a reason, and thus can be remedied by human will's well directed effort. Even Christianity had its pelagius. He was a British monk. He had a strong moral fibre. When he saw the loose-living priests and monks in Rome, he was outraged. He was deeply hurt when they insisted that they were born in sin, had no health in them and needed grace sorely. They could quote Jesus as saying that a healthy man needs no physician. Jesus said that just as only a sick man needs a physician, he had come to save only the sinners. Thus they took pride in not having 'stoic pride' of the morally strong. But Pelagius felt this to be a craven and laggard doctrine. He insisted that God does not demand what we

cannot wilfully achieve. We are corrupt and wicked by choice. The lives of Christ and others show us the way to follow it. But Augustine denounced Pelagianism. If man could will-fully chose the right he would not be tainted at source. If his initiative can choose and attain the good he would be perfectly holy without the help of Divine Grace. The view that man is a corrupt mass of perdition incapable of any good choice suits them most who magnify the loving grace of God. Hinduism too had its saints and even a few philosophers who claimed that the greater the sin the greater the glory of Divine Grace. Some even challenged God to saluate them if he could for their sins were beyond redemption. But it never became the main spine of Hinduism. Under Augustine this happened in Christianity. To be sure Augustine meant the original sinful nature of man rather than trivial sins, but few could make that fine distinction. It raised grave difficulties in the development of the science of ethics. The ethical interpretation of human life and character became a pagan delusion. Virtue did not become, in the western world, a harmonious and normal function of human nature. To be fair to Christian theologicians we have to say that they did try to recognize realisable convictions of ethical thought within the framework of Augustinian Catholicism. Thus consciousness of sin and consciousness of goodness are issues that need a decisive answer for every aspirant.

Augustine was followed by St. Anselm and St. Thomas Aquinas. Thus it became the Catholic and Protestant Christian view of the western world. But one must remember that the term 'original sin' is not found in the Bible. It knows the sinful man, but not the utter incapacity for goodness in him. Martin Luther, Calvin, Jonathan Edwards and a host of Protestant patriarchs held the view of Augustine in spite of their rejection of many orthodox ideas. Hence Christianity came into conflict with the scientific view of human nature as a continuously evolving goodness. Hinduism never faced such a crisis. In spite of Vallabha's thought of utter surrender, man's capacity to choose remained even in that surrender. This is due to the clear cut understanding of Vyāsa, Kṛṣṇa, Śaṅkara and others of man's nature propounded in the Upaniṣads. Man is dual in nature. The body-mind complex is always directing towards 'preyas' the sin, but the one who is the master, the self is non-different from Śiva and thus guiding as the inner controller, the antaryāmī, towards 'Śreyas', the good. The identification of the two is ignorance, the original *sin*. The more the disassociation the more is the Śiva nature manifesting. Once this identification is contradicted by experiential knowledge gained through revelation the liberation is here and now. Thus the Augustinian doctrine is true if man be held as merely the body. Even according to him the good in man exists but it is only God's work. Śaṅkara asserts that this is Śiva, man's real nature. So according to him the dual nature of man belongs to dual matter confused as one. Even where we are driven to some evil and its results the by the antaryāmī it is in reality for-good for at times the boil must ripe prior to its healing. True, in real life it is not easy to discriminate the direction of the antaryāmī and the body, for both are felt in the mind, yet metaphysically we can comprehend the duality. Eventually by a long practice we also discover the method to listen to the inner voice. The fundamental Vedic prayer, the Gāyatri is really for attaining this power. For an ordinary aspirant, the best thing is to ascertain whether a certain direction is for the sake of the body complex or not. If it be so it can safely be assigned to 'preyas' and avoided.

The present western society has practically denied the operative value of the doctrine, though holding to it on Sundays. The strongest preacher of the original sin on a Sunday is a practicing Pelagian in his weekly dealings. At times the hymnal liturgy follows Augustinian orthodoxy, while the sermon appeals to moral and spiritual capacities of man. With popular Hinduism it may be just the other way around. Philosophically emphasising the human effort, it

may compromise with the grace aspect religiously. The realisation that at times inspite of our best efforts we fail leads us to accept the divine part in our success as an ethical being, whether that divine part is internal or external, not withstanding. It is true that the varṇāśrama society did not demand too much of its members making excellence possible. The present day Hindu society has lost this advantage. Future holds the answer whether this experiment is for the good. In a free society demands in the ethical field increase in geometrical proportion making the rise of Augustinianism a possibility. Emphasis on Bhakti in the modern communication media of radio, television, magazines and newspapers is quite obvious for anyone to note. Added explosion of interest in astrology, magical rites, tantra etc. is clear as daylight. All this weakens the ethical fibre built up in several post Śāṅkara centuries. But perhaps in modernising or westernising the society one has to face this challenge.

The idea of grace implies certain fundamental questions. If man is a passive recipient of a wholly undeserved, force and finally an irresistible grace, why is it not granted to all but to only a few? Is a sinner's rejection of God included in his plans? Mādhwa may answer the questions in the affirmative. Pre-destined salvation goes against allethical effort. In certain stories of the Puraṇas such a doctrine is visible. But such a conclusion is self defeating for all scriptures and teachings are meaningless in this view of pre-destined salvation. So another theory is put up. God grants to all his gift of grace, but its effectiveness depends upon man's acceptance of it. Grace in this view is like the Sun who showers his rays on all the inhabitants on this earth. Some come out and enjoy it, others remain indoors and do not gain anything out of it; still others come out in the verandah, and so on. Śāṅkara Bhagawan uses this simile often enough. This is the actual vyāvaharika, pragmatic situation, for whether or not we accept the innate sinful state, we continuously expect man to become and behave better than before. Actually according to Vedānta company (saṅga) is the key to human conduct. If we could be continuously in contact with Śiva, as all Jīvanmuktas are, we are totally independently good. If we are in contact with the inner controller, the antaryāmi, we are generally good except when the past actions fructify in a way that restricts it. If we are in contact with good people our innate goodness becomes manifest. If we are addicted to joys of the body and thus in company with it our lower nature abiding in the identification becomes manifest. If we have friends who are of demonic nature we follow suit. Hence Vedānta is insistent on 'satsaṅga' good company. Since Christianity emphasised this lower nature as the *real* one, the whole western society has become addicted to creature comforts.

Modern science and Communism are the natural corollaries of this doctrine. A doctrine of total depravity of human nature leads one to forget about it since it is God who will claim whom He wishes, rendering it none of our concern. Reformation of man is possible only if he realises that he is corrupt. An utterly corrupt being will not recognize himself as such. It is the goodness in us which can realise the bad in us. Often enough an addict of tobacco, smuggling, blackmarketing or bribery does not realise that these activities are sinful. Tobacco is good for evicition. Smuggling is to make necessary things of life available to all sections of society at a reasonable rate against the high import duties of an unthinking government. Similarly black money is not black for taxation only cuts the poor man out of his pocket. Bribery is only a tip for the work done. This can go on. There was a Check pick-pocket who claimed pension for the practical socialism all his life reducing the richness of the rich classes. Rationalisation is endless. Thus there has to be goodness to recognize evil. Conviction of sin is an evidence of the capacity of becoming good. Augustine recognizes it and claims this due to Divine Grace. But a Vedānti questions what is it that is being reclaimed by God? If it is evil by nature, since nature never changes, it will remain evil. Therefore, in fact nothing has been

really achieved, only a natural good thing that has rotten has been reclaimed. Śaṅkara Bhagavad uses the simile of sandalwood, which smells for it has rotten becoming fragrant on being scraped, for the fragrance was already present even in the state of rottenness. An external agency, however supernatural, even God, cannot make one bereft of moral capacity, moral. Only if moral character is present at least as a capacity it can be developed by an extraneous help. Morality cannot be bestowed from without. If goodness belongs entirely to God, a creature can never be really good. But if a good soul has become corrupt then *really* he is not corrupt and can be reclaimed by Divine Grace. Thus Śiva is the reality of jīva who is totally good, and the body mind complex is non-good that is pāmā or sin. It is in this sense that in this and such similar contexts the term is used in Vedānta literature, since ignorance of the Real is the cause of false identification, ignorance can be called the 'original sin' a sin which is causeless. Such a causeless sin is not Adam's sin. It seems the idea grew out of such usage and was later on carried to Europe through Śaiva and Buddhist monks, and having been uprooted from its native semantics was misinterpreted. The influence of these Śaiva concepts in the theology of Christianity and Mohammadanism need much more research than has been done till now. According to a spiritual experience of the great Swamī Vivekananda, Jesus himself was initiated into the secrets of Gnosticism (गनमार्ग) in an island near Cyprus. There are evidences of Jesus having visited Kashmir and Tibet. Even in later centuries the religious contact was carried on and there were cross influences.

The Upaniṣad goes on to assert that the dreamer creates all that is seen in a dream. All this creation is merely impressions. Agency consists in being the substratum cause of the creation. Modification of mind as these impressions is the creation. Thus the creation here is told not to prove the reality of the dream, but to indicate that even in the waking state illumination is the only activity of the self. There is an interesting medical or psychomedical advice. A person should not be suddenly awakened, for if he does not find the right organ, the body becomes diseased and the disease of this type is incurable. This also indicates the separateness of the body and the self. Śaṅkara makes it clear that this is what the medical people say, and not that any injunction is being laid down by the Veda.

The third state of deep sleep is described as the state where unattachment of the self is clearly evident. It is its nest. Since this is its nest, here the self neither desires nor dreams. There is no sorrow in this state. It gives a clue to the final beatitude. To avoid the misconception that it is a state of unconsciousness, Yājñavalkya illustrates it with the illustration of a lover and beloved in a deep embrace after a long separation when they feel neither the mental world nor the physical world but just each other. Though unconscious of everything else they are yet conscious of each other. Similar is the state in deep sleep. All empirical distinctions cease, yet the self remains as a witness without losing the character of seeing. He goes on to explain why can the self not be the repository of past impressions or desires. He refutes Gautama and Kāṇada in detail who hold such view. He also refutes, Bhartṛprapañcha who held that the impressions remain on the self after illumination, as an after effect. In support of the self as a self-illuminating entity, he says that I is like the Sun who has never been lighted nor has ever gone off.

The Bhāṣya discusses the pervasiveness of space to show that it is not a quality of space. Space in association with the universe as a limiting adjunct is called all pervasive. It is just present everywhere. The Saṅskṛta word 'vyāpaka' means which has reached everywhere and 'sarvagata' means which has gone everywhere. Movement is an action that connects 'X' existing at a point 'A' to point 'B' so that 'X' exists now at 'B.' This means a thing that is naturally differentiated can move. Space is not so. According to Bhagavatpāda an atom is simply the

This means a thing that is naturally differentiated can move. Space is not so. According to Bhagawatpāda an atom is simply the pure quality, hence any quality cannot reside in it as it resides only in a substance (द्रव्य). Giri points out that Vedānta does not consider 'earthness' and 'smellness' as separate substances. A partless substance is never seen to have attributes. The self being partless does not have the attributes of seeing etc., seeing is its nature. Ignorance causes the distinction of the seer and the seen. The Nyāyanirṇaya raises the question whether knowing specific objects is its natural state, or absence of such knowledge is its natural state? If the former, deep sleep will be unnatural, and if the latter, then waking and dreaming will be unnatural. The question is fundamental to the mystic thought. World-affirmative mystics emphasise the fact that Śiva creates and protects, thus attaining Śiva cannot contradict the creation. The Śāktas go to the extent of emphasising the power over the substance (Śakti over Śiva). Creation or unfolding to them is greater than the being which is unfolding. World-negationist mystics emphasise the substance over the power. Being to them is superior metaphysically and teleologically to Becoming. Both these mystics in their deep state of absorption are unconscious of any one but God, yet during the ordinary active life they adopt a different life style. One actively engages in actions that assert the world as the real manifestation and a sense that its well-being is necessary to please God, while the other regards it just a necessary evil, an interlude to be absorbed again. Yoga is definitely world-negation. Bhakti is of both types. Some regard the service of devotees as the service of God, thus keeping a positive view. Other bhaktas regard the worldly activities as a snare to be avoided. The Mīmāṃsakas and the Naiyāyikas are definitely world-affirmative mystics. Śaṅkarāchārya is the only mystic who holds a well thought out philosophical view and Appaya Dīkṣita has elaborated it still further. There are two states of Being. From a fundamental (पारमार्थिक) view, the being is ever changeless for just as gold remains gold passing through the forms of all ornaments, the being remains the same. From a pragmatic (व्यावहारिक) view, ornaments have to be properly worn; similarly is the specific knowledge needed in this plane. A well trained goldsmith never forgets the changeless gold while dealing with the ornaments in a specific way. Similarly a mystic does all acts without for a moment being conscious that he and everything else is only Śiva. Consciousness is playing on the breast of consciousness is the pragmatic state of Being. The world-affirmation and world-negation in Vedānta are superseded by a wholistic view. Thus there is no contradiction in the life and metaphysics of Śaṅkara. Often enough people only read him without noting his life. Actually as the greatest Master of Humanity he lived the way we should act, he devoted the way we should feel and he philosophised the way we should think. All the three powers of humanity were exemplified in him. Thus pragmatically he rejuvenated Hinduism, reformed the Hindu culture and sects, and united the Hindu brotherhood. Since 'Hindu' represents pre-Islamic India we can say that he worked in the human society present before him without any distinction of class or creed. Thus we see him a committed mystic of the world-affirmative type. But he makes clear that in reality all distinction is in association with the products of ignorance. The substratum is ever unchanged. Then all these activities have no real meaning in the ultimate sense. This makes every moment complete in itself. Every drop of ocean is complete water, not partly water! Thus our attention should be concentrated on it as a whole. The activity then will not be for any result but for its own sake. Work will be its own reward.

Thus a comprehensive life scheme is drawn. In the first half, when the c'lan vital is strong, life in the world and life affirmation will be adopted. In the last half when the

e'lan vital is slowly ebbing out, life out of this world and life negation will be lived. Of course to western thinkers like Albert Schweitzer this seems a self contradiction. He says : "Brahmanism has the courage to be inconsistent and not draw the full conclusions from the knowledge. It manages to combine affirmation of life and its negation". But this clearly shows the western bias towards bipolarity of nature. The Vedic view has upheld the multipolarity, and modern physics as well as everyday experience supports this view. The Christian view of ethics which divides ethical choice as virtue or vice is not acceptable to the Hindu tradition which accepts various shades of grey in between. To use a familiar terminology of Patañjali the actions are white, black, black and white, neither black nor white. Thus one progresses towards the final beatitude in the stages of life. Of course if some one is a spiritual genius and thus can attain the highest here and now nothing can stop him. So the Upaniṣads lay down that the final stage of beatitude can be gained from the student life, work-a-day life or contemplative life.

Sometimes the concept of transcending good and evil is understood to support unethical action. Since gnostics and Nietzsche are commonly read in the Western World and since they uphold such a scheme under the banner of 'beyond good and evil', many feel that Śaṅkara must mean the same concept. But that is far from being a fact. He recommends non-activity which *transcends* good and evil actions, but never professes an action that is beyond good and evil. Only a person who renounces all the worldly and the other worldly possessions, along with actions that lead to such possessions, of discovering the truth of one's own being, has the right to be beyond good and evil. He will do no evil for all evil flows from ego-centric action. But he is also released from doing good as a *duty* for he has chosen to do the highest good i. e. liberation. In multipolar ethics of Hinduism it is an accepted fact that duty for a lower good is transcended by the duty for a higher good. Since the unity of one's own being with Brahman is the highest good, all other good deeds are no more good for him. Since to a view of world-affirmation this sounds sacrilegious, it has always denounced this. Many Smṛtis have laid down a number of duties even for a Sannyāsi. But the Āchārya has clearly established that such a view goes **against** the Vedic concept of renunciation. Substitution of one set of good for another is not renunciation. One attains the realisation of identity with the supreme self simply and *solely* by wisdom accompanied by renunciation of the world.

MEASURES OF BLISS

Yājñavalkya goes on to define the supreme bliss. Since nothing can be known if not related to an experience he relates to everyday joy the Supreme bliss for both are manifestations of the Supreme Self in the pure (sātvika) modification (vṛtti) of the mind. The difference is quantitative and not qualitative. But one must realise that though non-different qualitatively in a metaphysical sense, on an experiential sense it will be different even qualitatively. Just as a point, line, plane and solid are non-different qualitatively, yet appear to be entirely different from each other, yet we may understand a plane in terms of a line, so also the joy can make us glimpse into Bliss. As Śaṅkara points out, ignorance divides the Bliss into joy.

Health, wealth, power, enjoyments bring joy to man. These in complete measure bring one measure of joy called human-joy. Manes enjoy a hundred measures of this joy.

Slowly on this scale of joy the Supreme bliss is put as the highest. The absence of 'other' in the bliss sublimates all mathematical calculations. The Upaniṣad also makes it clear that the minimisation of desires leads to greater joy. Complete elimination yields the Supreme Bliss.

TRANSMIGRATION

A complete mode of transmigration is described. In the last stages of death the self gets particularised consciousness in consequence of its past works. He is not independent in deciding the particular consciousness. If it were so, all would be salvated. Hence one should laboriously and constantly practice yoga, meditation and virtuous deeds with faith in order to gain freedom to particularise the consciousness which one wants. The commentator makes a bold statement that all the prescribed codes of conduct of all the revelation are to dissuade human beings from wrong actions of the body and the mind. This must be done while one is free to do so, and not wait for the last moment because the flow of past impressions takes over the mind and the individual loses his independence. The statements of Śaṅkara here are impregnated with deep wisdom, such brilliant light on particularly thanatology is rarely found in the great mystic writers. Independence during the last moments of an individual is the result of a life-long practice of independence. A person who remains dependent on his body-mind complex most of his life, is bound to remain dependent even then. Thus a message of hope to all aspirants who strive is given here along with the warning to those who are lethargic. Giri makes it clear that worship of gods, charity etc. is not what the Bhāṣya is suggesting here. Just as people given to other-worldly gains practice these, a person aiming liberation should practice his own methods.

The soul takes food for consumption enroute. Devotion and actions performed in the form of resultant impressions and virtue or vice go with him as the food. The impressions of all physical and mental actions also accompany him for initiating fresh actions and fructifying the past virtue or vice. This last is needed, for organs are incapable of initiating any action without impressions about it. Both in action and sense-enjoyments we find some from birth to be experts, and others dullards. Thus these three are the food. Now one must compare this Vedānta view with the prevalent Paurāṇika view where all sorts of fanciful food or cartel is prescribed. Cultivating these three in an ethical way is the means to attain a safe journey.

When he goes, the organs become pervasive, for the body which limited them is no more functioning. Or one may even say that the karma which limited it has been exhausted. The organs always are established in the e'lan vital, which is pervasive. Thus the new body will have the pervading organs again functioning in it with the help of karina that has to be suffered in that body.

The transmigrating self discards the present body, thus making it unconscious, and takes hold of the new body that is being formed by fusion of the ova and sperm. The illustration given by the Upaniṣad is that of a leech leaving a blade of grass while holding on to the next blade. Organs, under the sway of actions performed that are to be fructified now, manifest their functions accordingly. The external body is also necessary to manifest consciousness. Śaṅkara uses the word kuśa and clay for the materials used for the external body. Perhaps he means that just as a cottage is made out of these, so is the body made. When both the bodies are formed the presiding deities grace the organs and they start functioning.

According to Vedānta this is the process of formation of a new body. Kaṇāda and the others hold their sectarian view while the common man has his own view and Paurāṇikas generally cater to the popular mind. The Upaniṣad illustrates the material by gold. Just as the goldsmith turns an ornament of gold into a more beautiful ornament, the soul turns the five elements as material cause of the earlier form into a more beautiful form. This gives a clue for the whole concept of purity on the physical level that is observed by a Hindu. Matter remains the same, life after life. Sin in Vedānta is a physical entity, since the mind itself is physical. Psycho-physical unity is a basic concept common to modern science and Vedānta. The new form is a better form or more beautiful form according to the Upaniṣads. The idea of better is covered by newer as far as the oldness (जोड़ता) is concerned. The Gītā has taken only this sense. But here on the whole the soul is evolving higher which is made clear by the nouns used to designate these forms viz. manes, minstrets, gods, Virāṭ or Hiranyagarbha. Thus it is easier to rise for the will of God is in that direction. To an aspirant this is a suggestion that he must strive for a higher state in the definite knowledge that the whole process is for our evolution. The message of Vedānta is that of hope. One is surprised to read later literature which is full of information about misery in the next life. Descriptions of hell abound when death is discussed. Here the Upaniṣad does not even mention hell.

Thus it is abundantly clear that desire is the root of empirical existence. As long as there is desire, rebirth is unavoidable. But one bereft of desiring nothing but the Supreme Self does not die but becomes identified with the Supreme Self here itself. The blind needs sight which is not a change of place or time. Freedom is cessation of ignorance. Identification with the body-mind complex due to ignorance is the cause of desire and desire is the cause of activity, which causes embodiment and mortality. Once this identification is dissolved mortality which is our nature becomes manifest. Śaṅkara discusses this topic in detail. He clarifies an important point that no new knowledge or bliss comes into being as far as the wise is concerned. It is only the removal of ignorance. Really speaking there is no difference between a bound soul and a free soul, but pragmatically they are different for the wise knows it and the other does not. Śaṅkara goes on to say that the one who knows false knowledge as false is not in illusion. Giri points out that the witness is not ignorant. Thus one who sees pragmatically the whole universe including the mental modification as different from himself appearing due to ignorance is not ignorant, but the wise one.

The Upaniṣad by means of an illustration conveys the idea of a liberated being. The lifeless slough of a snake is cast off by the snake and is not considered by the snake as being a part or whole of itself, yet it remains in the hole of the snake. Similarly this body discarded by the wise is not considered as a part or whole of his being. The wise is like the snake and the slough is like the body. A snake lives in the same hole as its slough but does not consider the slough as its self, so does the wise residing in the body not consider it as his self, but considers Śiva the All as his real self. He is disembodied and is no more connected with the body. Even earlier he was embodied in the sense that he identified himself with the body under the influence of his desires and past actions. This made him mortal by the death of the body. Now the ignorance of associating with desires and past actions leading to the identification with the body is no more present, hence he is immortal. Just as the snake never re-enters the slough, the wise never identifies with the body. Sureśwara in his Naiṣkarmyasiddhi says that a man having reached a safe place after running from a place of danger, if

independent, never wants to go back, similarly a wise one will never like to identify himself with the body anymore, no matter how close it lies. Āchārya Śaṅkara raises a side issue and concludes that the Veda can not make an unauthoritative statement even as an excuse like human beings. This is important to note, for many modern interpreters of the Veda take just this recourse in stating all that they have concluded by their own free thinking as the subterfuge meaning of a mantra or even a word. The idea has been extended to ridiculous lengths. If a particular name is not found in a text it is because the reciter would have lost consciousness if the name was uttered. However the name is present in two words because the letters of that name forms a part of these words. Vyāsa wrote the Bhāgawata is their own admission. It was recited by Śuka. The name of Rādhā does not occur in the text. The explanation given is along the lines mentioned above. Specially the Veda is a vast literature and such coincidences can be innumerable multiplied. This has made Hinduism a laughing stock of scholars. Śaṅkara has made it clear that the Veda can never be interpreted in this roundabout way by those who are Vaidikas and want to learn the maning of the Veda and not assign to it what *they* mean.

The teaching of Yājñavalkya is rounded off with prescribing renunciation as both, the means to this realisation and as the normal result of this knowledge. A mantra is quoted as an illustration of the declaration of a realised soul. The subtle and definite path to the Supreme has been attained. This is not a misleading path of a modern intellect based on mere logic, but the true way of the ancient Veda. Realisation, says Śaṅkara, is that which culminates in ultimate results on ripening. It can be compared to eating which ends in satiation at the end. But even the first morsal ensures that eating has begun. He points out that realisation is uniquely subjective. Self knowledge gives one the conviction that one has attained the Divine Grace that makes one attain all that is worthy of attainment. There is no gain higher than this. 'I am the Blessed One', this is the nature of self-knowledge. The Bhāṣya passage tantalisingly suggests that Śaṅkara is speaking out his own experience. This is what every wise man feels.

The Upaniṣad mentions that those who have not attained this knowledge but are aspirants practicing yoga etc., pass through certain nerves whose colour is considered by them as the colour of the way. This passage is important, for the 'nirguṇiā' saints have often talked of spectral colours being realised as the colour of the Absolute. Even in Christian and Moham-madan mysticism colour is important. The Tantras also speak of colours. All this belongs to the lower Brahman realisation and not the Reality as such. The same rule applies to the different sounds which are heard during meditation. The Tantras and Kuṇḍalini yoga refers to these sounds and colours on different chakras in detail. None of these experiences are denied, but none of them refers to the realisation of the Supreme.

The Nyāyanirṇaya observes that even though the word *heaven* means the abode of God,; it means liberation when spoken of as the result of supreme realisation, just as the word *light* means the Jyotiṣtoma sacrifice when used in that section even according to mīmāṃsā. This is an important observation for often we confuse ourselves by depending only on one of the meanings of a word common in the local dialect. The contextual meaning has to be decided by referring to similar passages in the different portions of the Veda, and then again according to the import of the purpose of the passage. And 'heaven' is a term used in this sense in the Upaniṣads (cf. Kena 4.9; Aitareya 3.4). Following this very rule Śaṅkara does not accept

the meaning pure for 'śukla' in the passage here. The context determines that the colour is import here and not purity, even though such a meaning would be more suited to Vedāntis. He concludes that liberation is the absorption of the body and organs in their material causes like the extinction of fire, which is the result of transformation of all into self and thus extinguishing all desires making transmigration impossible. The path is to first develop an ethical life, then to renounce all desires, then to identify oneself with Parameśwara. Such a one is the performer of the highest virtue and practitioner of the highest meditation.

After quoting Īśāvāsyopanṣad to assert that action and meditation without knowledge lead only to transmigration, the Upaniṣad asserts the importance of knowledge which leads to becoming all and creator of all independently. Longevity and absence of desire is natural to such a one. To realise, an aspirant should not become an addict to the complex scriptural words. Having got the certain knowledge from a teacher with the help of revelation one must practice renunciation, concentration, self control, withdrawal, fertility, calmness etc. Short words like ॐ are enough to concentrate the mind on the knowledge which has been gained.

Brahman residing in the heart as the Lord controlling and ruling all is the bridge to uphold all. It is sought after by Vedic study, sacrificial rituals, charity, penance and austerity. Knowing this one becomes a monk. It is the one who is the goal of all the wanderings of a monk. Thus all the paths prescribed in the scriptures have Brahma-wisdom as the final goal. The commentary points out that after realisation there is no difference between jīva and Śiva, thus the passage refers to the One principle. Wandering of a monk is often confused as a geographical moving about. But the Upaniṣad says that moving away from all other desires into this One desire of the Self is true wandering. The idea is that whenever there is a desire in the mind, one must move away from that desire, become its witness, and reach back to the goal, the desire for Śiva alone. This is the constant moving away. Since all actions lead to the fulfillment of some other desire one must of necessity renounce all actions. This is deduced by saying that 'pravrajanti' (wander away) means abstinence from all activities. Desiring any other thing apart from the Supreme Self one should not renounce action or duty. An inhabitant of Vārāṇasī does not move eastward to reach Haradwāra.

Śaṅkara utilises this occasion in discussing Sannyāsa. The word Brāhmaṇa in this passage refers to all the three viz., Brāhmaṇa, Kṣatriya and Vaiśya is Śaṅkara Bhagawad's considered opinion. Thus the opinions of some later writers that he did not include the Kṣatriyas and Vaiśyas in his scheme of self-knowledge is contradicted by his own statement here and at some other places also.¹ Scriptural study, sacrifice etc. stated here purify and prepare the soul to realise the Supreme taught in the the Upaniṣads. Regular rites are for purification according to the Veda. The one who knows that this organ is purified and improved by this rite is the Self-sacrificer according to the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa. Gautama and other codes also prescribe the saṃskāras for purifying the soul.

-
1. It should also be noted that the Mādhyandina recension does not have the term 'Brāhmaṇa' and the great Vidyāraṇya is quick to point out that as the three castes are given the right to study the Veda, here too they must be understood as having the right in Sannyāsa. (cf. pg. 116, lines 16 etc. in the said recension appended to this volume).

Fasting according to Śaṅkara is restrained enjoyment of all desires. Starvation, he remarks sarcastically, leads to death not self-knowledge. Thus he does not accept Kṛcchra, Chāṇḍrāyaṇa etc. as helpful austerities for an aspirant. The sarcasm is important for the Jains take starvation as an important means of salvation, and many Hindus have admired this starvation without realising the antagonism of Hindu scriptures to it. Giri clearly enunciates that fasting is being satisfied with whatever one gets without effort, and enjoying it with senses bereft of likes and dislikes. Śaṅkara says that all the duties are included here and they all purify the aspirant. Thus there is one final result of the whole Veda : Self-Realization; Desireless action leading to a purified mind which realizes the Self by the critical study of the Upaniṣads. Giri points out that the prescribed Vedic duties lead to desire for Knowledge, which in turn leads the aspirant to the teacher, his service and learning from him the revelation and its meaning. Thus the whole of Hinduism has been given here in a nutshell. Knowledge of the Self alone makes one a *muni* i. e. liberated in life. Muni is used a number of times in the R̥gveda Saṁhitā. It is one of the oldest designations of a monk. This indicates his main duty viz. to intensely reflect and analyse the self within and without. Wisdom about other things may make a person a muni but he will be a doer also for all knowledge apart from self-knowledge induces one to do something, to gain some purpose. Knowledge of anything that is non-self can but lead to its attainment or removal. Self-knowledge is knowledge about that which is already there, thus incapable of either being attained or removed. Thus it can make a person nothing else but a muni. Giri points out that even those seekers after liberation who desire self knowledge are to renounce all actions leading to vividiṣā sannyāsa, then what to say about those who have realised It. Intense dispassion is what leads to renunciation. Renunciation here includes particularised (सविशेष) meditation. Thus Saguṇa and also Sākāra Brahman meditation is prohibited for the one who seeks liberation. Here also it has been asserted that the one who knows Brahman as different from his own Self is rejected by it. So total renunciation of all actions and meditations is prescribed. Self knowledge itself is the Supreme Bliss, then why will any one indulge in any strenuous activity. Repentance of an evil act and joyful pride of a charitable act is not experienced by the wise. A wise monk destroys through his wisdom all the virtuous and vicious acts performed by him in the past and present lives. The eternal glory of the Self is neither increased nor decreased by any action. Calmness, self-control, withdrawal, patience and contemplation is the state in which self in oneself as well as in all the selves shines forth. 'This is the experience of the Supreme Reality that having been taught by me and having listened with reflection and concentration you have attained, Oh Emperor !' By this the Upaniṣad clearly points out that learning from a wise is the only way to become wise. No other practice is needed by an aspirant.

The emperor out of infinite gratitude offers the whole kingdom and himself also for the service of the preceptor. According to Yājñavalkya this state is the real Brāhmaṇa. This complete self surrender to the teacher is the crowning glory of Advaita. Yājñavalkya is the ideal teacher who does not stop short of satisfying the disciple, and making him realise the highest. Janaka is the ideal disciple who offers not only his possessions but himself to serve the teacher. Advaita emphasises this total surrender to the Guru who is identical with Śiva. Direct service to him and following all his orders and wishes even if only indirectly suggested is the only work left while alive. The disciple lives for the teacher and has his being in him. But this surrender has resulted from the realisation of identity and is not an emotional state. It is this spirit that has kept the tradition of Advaita intact to this day. The greatest service of

the teacher is to keep the torch of teaching blazing. If one can not directly do it one can help in every way those who keep it so burning. To indicate the all pervasive activities the Upaniṣad goes on to assert that this Self is the eater of food and giver of wealth. Since he dwells in all beings, it is he who eats all the food. Thus the way we attended to our bodies during ignorance, we attend to all bodies now. But we also know that one gets only what is the result of actions. Thus we never feel disappointed when we are not able to help a person. Fearlessness is the very seence of realisation. Śaṅkara also suggests, that one who meditates on the Supreme Self as the eater in all beings and the bestower of results of all actions, becomes an eater of great quantity and is blessed with possessions himself. Giri says that eater of food means a person with intense hunger.

Knowledge of the adjunctless Brahman leads to liberation, and meditation of adjunct-Brahman leads to a high state. This has been proclaimed in this chapter. Now the meaning of the whole Āraṇyaka is proclaimed. The creation, protection, dissolution etc., acts, means of acts, results etc., and negation of all this have but one purpose viz., conveying the knowledge of the Supreme. Śaṅkara gives a beautiful illustration. Combination of paper, ink and shapes are necessary to teach alphabet, but all this is not the alphabet, similarly teaching all the above is necessary to teach the Supreme but all this is not the Supreme.

The next section is a repetition of an earlier section. The restatement of a proposition after stating the reason is conclusion according to logicians. Thus it is the conclusion. In the Madhu-section renunciation with self knowledge was taught as the way to immortality. Yājñavalkya section established it rationally. Dealt in this way the wisdom dawns on a disciple according to the Upaniṣads.

The Āchārya deals exhaustively renunciation as an appendix to this chapter. He observes that except salvation all other good and bad depends upon the individual, for salvation alone is not a result of ignorance. Even a sarvasva yajña is prescribed for one who desires suicide, and the Mahābhārata states that Yudhiṣṭhira performed it prior to his great exit. One who realises that self-knowledge alone is the cause of salvation and thus has no concern with any other action, renounces all of them. This is the renunciation of a wise person. Renunciation is a unique experience of Advaita consciousness. One who strives for it is a vividiṣā sannyāsin and one who has attained it is a vidwat sannyāsin. Since both of them float swan-like, on the ocean without getting wet, both are called 'Supreme-Swans' or Paramhamsas. The organisation of renouncates or monasticism was entirely different.¹ It is a part of the social complex. The topical sannyāsa is concerned with spiritual experience, while the other with social *expression* based on that experience. Christian monasticism is entirely attuned to the second in the sense that the Church is the body of Christ, while Jainism is entirely centered in the first. Hinduism and Buddhism emphasises both the individual as well as the social aspect of monasticism. Sureśwara notes in his Vārtika on the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Bhāṣya that inspite of many differences with Buddhism we agree with them on the issue of renunciation. Indian religion and philosophy are so integrated that every school has its own renunciates. The external form has many similarities in all the schools. One can see a continuity of the organisational scheme from Buddhist viḥārs to Daśanāmī Akhādās, even to the modern Rāmakṛṣṇa Mission. The Vedic tradition which Śaṅkara established can not preach isolation and indifference. Actually two different conceptions

1- Cf. V rtikasāra संन्यास एव त्रिविधो विद्वद्-विविदिषा-ऽऽश्रमैः ॥ 3.5.60 ॥

indicated above mingle in the history of monasticism. Sacrifice for the sake of the Divine and duty as the means of training the will is one of the conceptions. Cutting the knot that keeps the world and body identified with Truth and Consciousness is the second conception. Renunciation aims at progressive development of the various aspects of human personality which makes the social ideal feasible. The biological division of four stages of life is fundamental and a Vaidika can not reject it even in view of monasticism. Thus in the Vaidika view renunciation implies absence of mechanical and blind contact with the world superficially but attaining a tranquil mind that transforms it to motiveless religious contact, free from all anxiety, egotism and aggrandizement. Reflection and self-culture are the foundations to eliminate human conditioning that divides the aspirant from the universe.

Advaita Vedānta embraces both religion and philosophy. It does not sunder faith or reason. Since the European culture keeps religious faith and philosophical conviction apart from each other, it does not need to accept two faces of truth. They have one truth and one faith. Advaita has two faces of the truth, pragmatic and metaphysical. It assesses the tradition and assigns it a status. Renunciation is both traditional and transtraditional (āśrama and atyāśrama). Śaṅkara claims the supresery of Karma-Sannyāsa as a means to wisdom because it helps directly in eradicating completely the ignorance of ego which is the only hurdle in man's freedom. Without completely rising above the conditioned status that man finds himself in, he cannot gain wisdom. Moral and spiritual disciplines (अमानित्वादि and अद्वेष्टादि in the Gita) are to be cultivated to rise to this stage. But the emphasis must be on the inward experience that is of the nature of intuiting the identity of Śiva and jīva rather than making it a mechanised observation. This at times may imply transcending the urban conception of morality. The tantras speak of Karma-Sāmya, and the Pāśupata Sūtras speak of laughing etc. in this context.

Renunciation of Śaṅkara is not a negative ideal since it is a part of a positive view of life. We must admit that certain subjects did emphasise a negative view, for Advaita at one time had become the whole of Hinduism and thus associated with the yoga school, but they never became the major Vedānta view. The school which Śrī Bhagavatpāda established was closely followed by the Daśanāmī order of monks that he established. This order was alert to the needs of all who belonged to its fold representing various aspects of human nature and provided practical guidance to mankind (Farquhar in 'The Religious quest of India'). Thus the ideal of renunciation in the Upaniṣads, the Brahma-Sūtras and Gitā are, as Śaṅkara points out gnoseological as compared to the smārta ideal which is socio-religious. He regards renunciation as the highest spiritual knowledge as intuitive and revelatory wisdom, while to the smārtas it is the last of the four stages of life. But renunciation in Advaita is based on the metaphysical structure of reality and its mystic intuition. Brahman-consciousness is to be had only through gnosis and its practical pursuit is sannyāsa. He thus advocates neither pure intellectualism nor simple moralism. Transcendent Realisation is intimately connected with Revelation. Since the world is an *appearance* of Brahman it has to be renounced. But precisely due to this it does not mean the denial of all given reality. Śaṅkara denies names and forms but not the one who appears under their guise. Thus empirical knowledge is not discarded. Only its empiricism is to be realised. One has to remember that empirical knowledge rests in the infinite consciousness as its substratum which alone is Real. This denial is renunciation. Confusion of the emperical and the metaphysical is to be renounced.

He asks us to renounce or reject only this misconception and nothing else. The empirical knowledge of the universe, society, ethics, psyche, etc. in the form we experience them are due to lack of self-knowledge resulting in not seeing it as Śiva, and imagining this separateness as metaphysically real. Self-knowledge removes this metaphysical error and sannyāsa installs this identity. Sannyāsa thus is accomplished not by discriminating the world (अनात्मनः) from its source (आत्मनः) alone or renouncing the world, but seeing the world as it really is viz., really unreal. Thus Advaita sannyāsa is not a negative state. Historically Śaṅkara reacted against all negative religion. Wisdom is the completion of intuition, reason and feeling on a mystical plane. Since metaphysically Śaṅkara bases himself on the positive integral experience of the self, the renunciation as the sole means must of necessity be positive, else it will defeat its own ideal. Renunciation to Śaṅkara is withdrawal from the imperfect profane world into a mode of perfect pure existence indicated by the Guru and the Upaniṣads. Individual sannyāsa is removing an error to manifest the glory of Brahman and infinite Bliss. Thus Manu says that by subjecting his body-mined complex to the Divine Will one attains immortality without tormenting the body. Renunciation thus is constant vigilance to perfect oneself by controlling the negative desires. It is not a barren life of isolation. The Gītā points out that a man free from egoity and attachment kills not even if seen killing. The world is not negated but re-interpreted as Śiva. The world is not merely a subjective sensation. It can be further enriched by removing the ignorance associated with it. Self-realization is a case of gaining depth without adding to the stock of knowledge, according to Murti (Bhattachārya Memorial volume p. 137). Thus knowledge is insight, not information. Realization of truth implies its being unknown i. e., its ignorance. The process includes the grace of Śiva and dedication to Him according to the Śivetaśvatara Upaniṣad. Rudolf Otto in his 'Mysticism East and West' clearly states "Śaṅkara is a passionate theist. If he was the greatest teacher of his time, the restorer of pure Vedāntic doctrine, the antagonist and destroyer of sects, false teachers and mistaken philosophers, he was this in the name of Brahman whose foremost and fundamental definition is world-creating, world sustaining and world dissolving God." Sannyāsa thus at the lower level is being aware of Śiva as the single material and efficient cause of the universe, even though carrying on with the empirical causes in day to day life. This lifts our spiritual life above the worldly life. He is also the saviour since it is His grace (आत्मनिर्दिशक्ति) that bestows the saving knowledge. This implies abjuration of the ego-centric will. Śaṅkara recommends the sacrifice of the individual will in the fire of Śiva's will. Denial of his will based on metaphysical conviction of God as the inner-controller raises the seeker above mundane worries. Thus God-centered love and God-directed will is the first stage of sannyāsa. Slowly it develops an enlightened view which faces the world without exhausting within it. A sannyāsī does not cease to act but all his acts are metaphysically cancelled in the unbroken wisdom. The world stands renounced for it can not delude him any more. He functions within the space-time-causality with the consciousness of spaceless, causeless, timeless infinity. It is something like a modern mathematician who realises the decimal system as only one model out of infinite ones, yet carries on in the day-to-day world strictly within the decimal system. Or a physicist knowing the relativity of the earth still works as if it is absolute. Thus a sannyāsī cannot be excluded from a life of activity for the good of others which mainly includes teaching the highest wisdom. Śaṅkara explicitly lays it down in his commentary on the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad that this is a rule.

Manu lays down that an action performed for a result here or hereafter is extroversion (प्रवृत्त) and an action performed without attachment to such result and with insight is introversion (निवृत्त) (XII 89-90). Meditation and reflection, learning and reasoning, serving the Guru etc. are prescribed for the seeker and the exclusion of all other activities, individual or social. Once the wisdom dawns he becomes an illustration for the others. He acts absolutely unmotivated, in complete lack of egoity and in complete harmony with the inner realisation that he is different from the others. Thus his actions cannot be judged by psychological considerations. This is the 'a'-morality of the wise. Scriptural and social injunctions are addressed to an ignorant person and not to one who has become his own light. Vedānta is not Sāṅkhya. It does not hold the world different from Brahman. In enlightenment all remains as it is, except the attitude, even the attitude about action. Action is seen as in-action to quote Vāsudeva Kṛṣṇa. Before realisation action is dedicated to God and aimed at world-solidarity. After realisation action is sublimated into knowledge and virtues shine as his nature. Vaśiṣṭha points out that a detached and pure mind due to desirelessness is the differentiating mark of a wise. Sannyāsa frees one from the ego and the feverish activity to gratify the endless personal desires. It also is rooted in the unshakable conviction of unity leading to love. The concept of rights no longer haunts him. His acts are inconsequential as far as results accruing to him are concerned. He relates neither future nor past with his actions but performs them as in an eternal present. This is the ideal free life of a monk. He lives the present with a smiling heart. Renunciation is a pure mental attitude, *not* an escape from life's problems. It is the gradual elimination of everything other than Brahman. Anxiety is the recognised motive behind all human striving including religion. Renunciation terminates this anxiety. Thus a sannyāsī is called steady-minded (स्थितप्रज्ञ), devotee (भक्त), beyond qualities (गुणातीत), established in the Supreme (ब्रह्मस्थ), beyond stages of life (अतीवर्णाश्रमी).

Vedānta is a scheme of spirituality in which cosmic and individual interests fuse into one. Renunciation is the means which annihilates the ego which is the gulf between the two. It creates a new attitude towards the world. This is not an achievement, but realisation for it is the eternal truth. The wise is not kind but just natural. Vedānta asserts that this is the only way to attain freedom. A vividiṣā sannyāsī conscientiously practices what the vidvat sannyāsī naturally is. Total renunciation of personal interest transcends the duality of the ethical world. Śaṅkara regards renunciation as a state of fearlessness. This influences the social dimension of life. Renunciation of a Vedānti is compatible with general social development and is a guide to social conduct. It lays the foundation of social harmony. A paramahansa is not irrelevant to value orientation of inter-social behaviour. Commitment is an important stimulant for motivation. A definite view of reality brings a definite commitment. It makes one interpret situations in the right perspective leading the seeker towards spiritual perfection. Actually the universe contains both a harmonious principle of cooperation of parts and a disorderly destructive principle. Since God is Real and is the substratum of continuous eternal Becoming, the aim of religion is to utilise this for the service of Śiva who is instrumental to the individual freedom. Some thinkers like Stepher A. Tyler have pointed out that orthodox schools like Mīmāṃsā, Vedānta, Śaivism, Smārta etc. have emphasised the social harmony and the heterodox like Buddhism, Chārvāka have emphasised the individual liberation as the goal. Individual as a part of the cosmic order is instrumen-

tal in maintaining it, and as Brahman he is free from it, is the basic Vedāntic view. Sannyāsa resolves duality by the Mahāvākya. Egoism, narrow-mindedness, greed, acquisitiveness, domination, exploitation etc. are non-values. A detached spirit (renunciation) purifies social activism rather than killing it. Śaṅkara gave this an institutional base. Renunciation as an individual practice is bound to get modified on institutionalisation and become a part of the general social organisation. This itself is the proof that Śaṅkara did not regard complete withdrawal as renunciation. Complete withdrawal is never an institution which is the life of people given to a specific goal. Monastery then is a social corrective. Vedānta has no founder and thus this becomes an important organ of the entire Sanātana dharma in preserving and transmitting it. Heads of these organisations are renowned for their spiritual discipline, culture and self-control. They are the fountain-heads of perpetuating the spirit of egolessness and self-denial in a society which is geared to these ideas. The organisation that the Āchārya built up was on the Vaidika lines and not at all indebted to Buddhist Vihāras except in minor details. Emile Durkheim in his 'Elementary Form of Religious Life' mentions : "It is a good thing that the ascetic ideal be incarnated eminently in certain persons whose speciality, so to speak, it is to represent almost with excess, this aspect of the ritual life, for they are like so many living models, inciting to effort. Such is the historical role of great ascetics. It is necessary that an elite put the end too high if the crowd is not to put it too low". Hinduism alone builds the philosophy of renunciation on the realization of higher self-fulfilment. It is not born as a disgust from the worldly life as far as Advaita is concerned. To Advaita secular and sacred are not distinct objects, hence renunciation transforms the secular into sacred. Thus all actions become sacred. Renunciation out of disgust is being yellow (हृदयदीर्घत्वम्). Thus the property is owned by a Maṭha collectively and *not* individually. All of it must be for the propagation of Dharma according to Śaṅkara. In so far as it does away with all sense of belongingness to the individual, it would lend support to an effort to dissolve private property. Mahatma Gandhi's idea of trusteeship was a corollary of the Vedānta view on the lower plane rooted in the highest truth. Śaṅkara defines Dāna as 'saṁvibhāga' in his Taittirīya Bhāṣya, which means equitable distribution. The absence of causality for renunciation of physical inconvenience makes it demonic according to the Gita. Śaṅkara also lays down that the abbot must be moving about for the propagation of all that is needed for the growth or development of the nation and Vedānta culture. Thus renunciation is as far away from isolationism or escapism as self-aggrandizement and self-indulgence. And history is proof of this practical side of Vedānta. Vidyāraṇya founded the Vijayanagar Empire and Madhusūdana Saraswatī founded the army of Nāgā sādhus to protect the Hindu Nation and its culture. Thus renunciation was developed by Śaṅkara as the perfect model for the whole society. Final renunciation undoubtedly was that of a vidvat-sannyāsin. That is why at the end of the main portion of the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, which is really the end of the Yajurveda, Śaṅkara points out that the whole of the teaching is for the knowledge of Brahman culminating in renunciation. This is the final instruction, the whole of the Vedic teaching, the ultimate goal. In this ends, man's effort to achieve his highest good. The way he introduces the discussions itself shows the importance of the topic. He says : "We are going to discuss to clarify the meaning of the scriptures." Then he also discusses various alternative suggestions. In one of the alternatives it is suggested that since the Brāhmaṇas are the teachers, they alone should be allowed the sannyāsa which is put as an ideal for society. Warriors and members of the economic group may go on performing their duties since they are

needed to uphold society's everyday life. Though in a way he agrees to this alternative, yet he concludes that such hard and fast rules would go against the Vedic tradition which allows a person's capacity, knowledge, non-attachment, desire etc. to decide the option with regard to renunciation. He obviously means that social norms should not be disturbed, but what may be allowed for a Brāhmaṇa with ease, may not be so easily allowed for the Kṣatriya and the Vaiśya. But of course intensity of renunciation and desire for knowledge in them may force taking even these people into consideration. A discussion of this type definitely gives a lie to those who hold that Śaṅkara was unnecessarily pro-sannyāsa and anti-social.

The Muni Kāṇḍa is rounded up with the list of traditional teachers. It is to indicate that an uninterrupted succession of teachers and disciples ensures that revelation is conserved, transmitted and re-lived. A living culture presents the treasures of the past and creates those for the future. Remembering the tradition helps in receiving the grace of these teachers.

THE FIFTH CHAPTER

The first two chapters dealt directly with Brahman, the next two dealt with It in a rational way. Thus the teaching of Brahman has been concluded. Now start the two chapters which are like appendices. The fifth starts with the absolute Brahman, goes on to prescribe certain meditations of Īśvara, sense-control, charity and kindness as means to self-knowledge and the worship of Gāyatrī. The next chapter takes up meditation on the vital force, the five fires etc., and certain rituals of house-holders like the naming ceremony, the conception ceremony etc. Thus there is no particular topic, but generally all that which has not been included in the main body of the text. The fact that they are treated now does indicate that the Upaniṣad tries to inform that though nothing really remains for a wise one to take up seriously, whatever scattered prārabdha remains has to be worked out in a natural way without a motive or master urge of any kind.

The first verse is one of the most quoted one and is most meaningful to an Advaita aspirant. It asserts that the Absolute experiences the adjunct of the body due to ignorance and again experiences freedom due to knowledge. The learned editor has brought this out and compared it to the verse of Madhusūdana Sarasvatī in the Advaita Siddhi. Śaṅkara regards it as a mahāvākya. He points out that even when the 'created' comes out the wholeness of Brahman is not effected just as a rope does not lose its wholeness on becoming a snake. By identifying the wholeness of the universe with individual self by wisdom, one gets rid of the feeling of separateness caused by the contact of material adjuncts, the Absolute alone remains. As Śaṅkara points out it is an identical statement with the earlier one where it was asserted that "the self was indeed Brahman in the beginning, knowing Itself It became All". This verse comes here to indicate that the following meditations and moralities are meant for attaining this state of wisdom. It is equally to associate with the concept of renunciation, the wholeness of both—the cause and the effect states of Being. Wholeness of this means wholeness of Īśvara. But as the Great Master points out, Bhartṛprapañcha and others were misled by this verse in believing that (a) the Absolute is at times diad and at times monad; (b) manifestation and dissolution are true even from a real stand point; thus (c) renunciation is not the only aim of the Veda but activity is as much its real purport during manifestation. But this will make the Upaniṣad and Karma portions of the Veda identical, that is both will not be dealing with the Real for the Real does not change according to states. The Absolute can have neither parts nor states. Nor can there be an alternative statement about the Real. If the monad and diad are considered real simultaneously, it will be self-contradiction, for

both are opposed to each other. There is contradiction in assuming such a possibility with both the scriptural as well as logical sides. Thus the great dialectician states that it is better to reject the Upaniṣad than to assume such illogical categories. A Brahman teeming with differences and having parts has never been proclaimed by the Veda either for meditation or realization. Seeing multiplicity or heterogeneity in It is in fact prohibited. Thus that which is prohibited can never be the real intention of the scriptures. This must be always kept in mind. Many of the later Vaiṣṇavas forgetting this, tried to establish their conjectured theories as Vedānta. But the Upaniṣads clearly maintain that the Absolute is Whole and homogeneous. Since naturally all people accept the reality of the manifested world, it is not necessary to assert it by revelations. Giri points out that people stubbornly addicted to actions dislike those who talk of the unreality of the manifested world. Nor does the illusory view of the world stop people from running after the objects, as is evident in the Buddhists. The Buddhists regard the self as illusory and yet are seen to run after the joys of the world. This is because illusoriness of a thing does not inhibit its power to produce results. Similarly agnihotra will bear fruits irrespective of the reality or illusoriness of the world. This is an important observation of Giri for often the aspirants wonder why their hankerings do not die after they are convinced of their illusoriness. Just as a medical practitioner knowing well the nature of the human body which is disgusting, still gets infatuated with it, so does the aspirant even after discrimination get attracted by the world. Actually the scriptures only teach the means, and do not prescribe the end. If a person has worldly joy as the end, karma will be the part that will be of interest to him. If on the other hand a person is disgusted with them and wants to attain the Real, Wisdom will be his aim. Then again, the scripture will be of no use to him who desires *nothing*. Before the dawn of wisdom, revelation reveals. After the dawn of wisdom, nothing remains to be revealed. The Veda becomes Non-Veda says the Śruti. Revelation, revealer, discipline are all inter dependent. When Śiva alone stands without a second, where will any conflict be. Thus this verse can rationally be interpreted only in the Vaidika sense. Both the aspects of Brahman are whole. Īśvara is relatively whole and the Supreme is the unrelated whole. Jīva is whole covered by material sheaths thus appearing to be partial and seeing the world also partially. But since all this is due to ignorance, wholeness itself remains unaffected.

MEDITATION ON SPACE

Aum is to be repeated while meditating on space or the space-like Liṅga. Even though Ātmā, Brahma etc. are words used for the Supreme, Aum is considered by the Veda to be the most intimate name of the Supreme, and thus it is the best mantra for japa to realise the Truth. It can be either used as a symbol or as a name. Just as an image of Viṣṇu is regarded as identical with Viṣṇu for performing puja etc., Aum can be treated as identical with Brahman. Use of this symbol brings about the grace of Brahman. Since the Supreme is beyond perception and conception, an ordinary aspirant finds it difficult to hold on to It without a symbol, so he is asked to concentrate on the inner-most self with the help of this symbol full of faith and devotion, as the Vaiṣṇavas do on the stone image of Viṣṇu. Alternatively the conditioned Brahman in the form of sky can be meditated upon. Aum in either case is to be used as an image. The meaning of space changes according to the capacity of the aspirant.

Aum can be used as a name also. The Veda is the knowledge by which whatever is to be known is known. Aum is the Veda which the wise ones know, and knowing it know everything.

Hence the aspirant also attains wisdom through Aum. Aum is the whole of the Veda, its repetition is as efficacious as the repetition of the whole Veda. All the Vedas are born out of and are identical with Aum. Thus it is the best sound symbol i. e. name of Brahman.

CONTROL, CHARITY AND COMPASSION

Those that are to be practiced as parts of all the meditations are being prescribed. The creator of the universe addresses to all his created beings. As Śaṅkara points out, only man, being rational comprehends oughtness. And mankind can be divided as having all good virtues yet uncontrolled called *devas*, misers called *manuṣyas* and the cruel called *asuras*, or following Kapila, the Sāttvika can be called *devas*, the Rājas as *manuṣyas* and the Tamasa, *asuras*. Thus the message is addressed to the whole of mankind. This is important because here we have a clear indication that the message of the Upaniṣads is not confined to any particular community, creed, sex or caste.

These three kinds of men stayed with the creator, their father practising the rules of discipleship. At the end of the stay, the *devas* asked to be instructed. The Father uttered only 'Da'. They were satisfied, but to make sure, the father asked them what they had understood. They replied, 'As we are unruly, you have asked us to keep control over ourselves'. The father was pleased to know that they had understood correctly. The same procedure was repeated with the men. Being naturally avaricious they realised that charity was to be practised by them. Similarly, being cruel, compassion was taught to the demons. The Upaniṣad goes on to proclaim, that lightening and thunder is teaching this even to-day. Thus the Veda is suggesting that God in the form of nature is always teaching us. We have to stay with nature in a mood of discipleship to learn from it. Thus Vaidika knowledge is being given to all beings, but it is the true aspirant who can understand it. This makes the Sanātana Dharma the eternal religion. All other religions peg themselves on to an individual. The Sanātana Dharma worships and learns from nature. Science also is reading nature. It reads the physical script of nature, we the spiritual one.

Śaṅkara points out a psychological element in the episode. All persons instinctively know their faults. Hence the three knowing their guilts, and knowing that elders dissuade from evil, responded the way they did. Realisation of one's fault is important. Once that dawns, instruction is easy. For the philosophy of education this is an important suggestion of the Veda. We must increase the desire to know in our method of teaching rather than flood information. Thus one conquers the three basic faults viz. lust, anger and greed. Getting rid of them makes one fit to practice any meditation. These must be practiced even though the environment is not conducive to them. Without control we ruin ourselves by becoming anxious and running a never ending race with objective joys. Compassion and charity make us love in action rather than remaining on an intellectual or emotional feeling of sympathy. The virtues present, promote and enhance the spiritual value of life.

HEART MEDITATION

Thus having finished the topic of the Supreme Brahman meditations on Brahman with adjuncts will be prescribed for attaining prosperity and other results. Giri points out that destruction of vice is the real prosperity. Śaṅkara says that the previous section mentioned that the Creator instructs. The question is, who is the Creator? The present section clarifies that the heart is the creator. 'Heart' means the intellect residing in the heart. It is the same in which name form and actions were said to have merged in the last chapter and which is the

abode of all quarters. This resides in all beings and is identified with them all. This 'Hṛdaya' is Prajāpati. Thus it is clear that it was the heart that taught 'Da'. This intellect must be worshipped as Brahman. Thus this meditation implies that whatever we understand must be taken to have been understood by the power bestowed by Brahman. To such a meditator people bring gifts, power (शक्ति) and he goes to heaven. The idea is that such meditations help even a mediocre aspirant by fulfilling his worldly desires, and in the process taking him inwards to the inner self. External worships may bring the same results but will not help in inner spiritual development.

OTHER MEDITATIONS

The same Brahman can be meditated as the origin of the five elements are the first born. Thus Brahman associated with them is the most adorable and such a meditator wins all enemies. The editor points out this meditation is non-different from the Sun-worship in the following section according to the Brahma Sūtra. Śaṅkara informs that the actions residing in some unknown way in matter give rise to matter. Untruth does not harm the one who meditates in Satya-Brahma. It is manifest in the sun cosmologically. The earth, sky and heaven are the three sections of its body. One knowing thus gets rid of sins.

The next meditation is of the mind as Brahman. Here the instrument of knowledge is meant by 'mind'. Whatever the mind observes is through Brahman. The Yogis see it as an atomic structure. It should be meditated as the lord, ruler and governor of all that it observes. Such a one becomes a ruler when the meditation is perfected. The idea is that observation makes the mind obedient. An obedient mind makes one a ruler.

Lightening, speech as milch-cow and cosmic fire are all one by one associated with Brahman for meditation. The Cosmic fire is connected with the digestive fire where the symbol is the sound heard after closing the ear. Meditation on this is one of the important meditations of the later Nirguṇiā sects of Northern India.

The result of these meditations is the attainment of Hiraṇyagarbha. The meditator first goes through an entry through the air, then an entry through the sun and then through the one in the moon. The idea seems to be that one first gets disassociated with activity, then the sense-organs and lastly the mind. Attainment of the Hiraṇyagarbha state is beyond mental conception.

AUSTERITY, GĀYATRĪ, LAST PRAYER

Fever etc. are illnesses that can be utilised to do austerity. One must look at it in this way : One should neither condemn the disease nor be dejected over it. This attitude wipes out the sins. A dying man also can meditate himself being carried after death to the place of cremation. This is an austerity since going away from home never to return is an excellent austerity. Similarly the body being placed on a pyre is also austerity. Such meditations lead one to higher worlds. The idea is that the body must be seen as suffering, leading to an attitude of witness for the suffering. This helps an aspirant in disassociating himself from the body.

The couple of prāṇa and anna are to be meditated as merging into unity with the help of 'Viram' (वि-रम्) mantra to become attractive to all people. Similarly meditation on life-breath is prescribed. Then the gāyatrī which is the mother of Brāhmaṇas is made the subject of meditation. Gāyatrī is so called because it protects the vitality or the life-breath.

Many passages indicate that a Brāhmaṇa attains the Supreme Brahman. This, Śaṅkara points, out is due to Gāyatrī. Nothing obstructs the spiritual development of the one who depends on Gāyatrī. Gāyatrī entitles a person to receive any amount of gifts without harming him. Śaṅkara is emphatic that one who has been initiated into Gāyatrī is a Brāhmaṇa. It is said that though some maintain that one should be initiated in Sāvitrī mantra, it is not proper to do so. Their contention is that speech is Sarasvatī in the body. But Gāyatrī is the one who protects prāṇa, and prāṇa includes all senses including speech, as will be clear in a following section. It is interesting to note that at Puṣkara, according to a Purāṇa, Brahmā wanted to perform a sacrifice. Gāyatrī was late and auspicious time was being wasted. So Brahmā took Sāvitrī as his wife. Gāyatrī came and was enraged. She cursed Brahmā. The present passage in the Upaniṣad seems to supply the base of this story. Hiraṇyagarbha should be worshipped in the higher sense of Gāyatrī, which includes both the lower and the higher Brahman. Some worshipped it only as the lower Brahman and were unable to get the highest result. Giri points out the mantra which is implied here. Gāyatrī includes both the definitions of jīva, Īśvara and their identity, complete refuge in God. That is why it is the best prayer.

The person who practices rituals with meditations should pray at the time of death to the sun for he is the deity of Gāyatrī. The aspirant prays for uncovering the truth, so that he can realise the truth while his body merges into the earth. He says that he has practised truth all his life, and hence he is identical with it. Giri points out that the conditioned Brahman is visible to those who concentrate with effort, though invisible to others. Thus it is clear that meditation brings the vision of the Supreme. Giri also points out that the reality of Dharma i. e. ritual and good conduct is Brahman. The vision is of the most benign form. 'The three vyāhṛtis are of him who is I myself.' Thus this passage suggests the realisation of Īśvara as the end of life.

The Madhu and the Muni portions dealt with the Absolute predominantly. But now the aspirant not fit for the highest ideal is being told that he must orient all his activities towards the lord, all emotions must be centered in Him and He alone should be the ultimate object of all inquiry. Śiva is free from evil, age, desire, sorrow, hunger, thirst. Whatever He wants comes into existence. The Sūtrabhāṣya points out that the individual is not really real but only the pragmatic form of Śiva, having come into being during ignorance, thus stained by desires and attached to enjoyment and its agents. He gets dissolved in Parameśvara, its really real form. This search is far from any negation of life. Actually it requires maximization and elevation to the highest level and utmost intensity as the life principle. Nature must pulsate with Śiva in it. The integrated view of religion and philosophy asks us to realize the timeless one present in the depth of our heart, as our life principle. Śiva is a personal-impersonal principle who may not assume forms. That is why Śiva worship is exclusively dedicated to liṅga which is not a form and yet can be treated as one. Śaivism insists that Śiva is never born, He only manifests due to an aspirant's love in the form the aspirant wants to see Him. The same Śiva is at the moment of Brahmajñāna realised as Ātmā. An aspirant gradually moves towards his centre, which is his wholeness, his metaphysical reality. Whitehead, in his 'Science and Modern World', defines true religion as the vision of something which stands beyond, behind and within the flux of immediate things, something which is real and yet waiting to be realised, something that gives meaning to all

that passes and yet eludes apprehension, something which is the ultimate ideal and the hopeless quest. This 'something' is the Godhead of Advaita. Here the siddha becomes the sādhyā. The quest however is not hopeless, for it is based on a metaphysical reality. Of course, as the Laṅkā Candrikā points out, the very idea of realising pure consciousness is illusory, yet the final knowledge that destroys all illusions is called the knowledge of consciousness (pg. 816). The ego being a superimposition is unreal. From an ultimate view its freedom is as illusory as it itself. On analysing 'I', it just evaporates. From an empiric view of course, God appears as 'I' in the body. Thus He alone is the ruler within. Tracing all evil, at least moral evil, to man's free will, is really futile as an explanation of evil. The root of evil in Vedānta is the mind and nescience. Once the mind is constantly impressed with Śiva it is impossible to have evil in it. Man instinctively acts to secure or to avoid, but failures make him realise that it is a blind alley. He comes to question his situation and eventually his own self. Analysis of the situation leads to Īśvara, and that of the self, to consciousness. Their unity is proclaimed by Vedānta which can either be intuited here and now which is jñāna, or meditated upon so that one goes to the Brahmāloka. The second is the path for those who find themselves incompetent for the first.

In the beginning there is bound to be a duality between the soul and God, but it must end in unity. An aspirant must start with the concept that he is a servant of Śiva, Guru and the tradition of the realised souls, but the monotheism must be a complete one. Supreme consciousness is one without a second. As Mahādevī says "Śiva supplies oranges and lemons sour water, sugarcane and coconut, sweet water; rice and wheat, nourishing water; rose and jasmine, scented water. One water becomes many due to association. Similarly Śiva appears as many." Polytheism is against the grain of Advaita. Śiva in Advaita is an ideal and not merely a Paurāṇika figure. The human skulls are his plate because he dines through the mouths of all beings, and he knows the knowledge stored in all skulls. Sākṣijñāna is jñāna of jīvajñāna. Śiva residing in the heart is adorned with skin and bones. Thus every Paurāṇika story or epithet is to suggest a psychological, religious or spiritual idea in a figurative way. He is beautiful attractive, a benevolent and indulgent father whose kindness is limitless. Each aspirant is allowed to imagine Śiva to suit his likings. The freedom allowed by Patañjali of meditating the Lord as one likes, has full operation here. This is possible, for all forms are equally unreal from the highest view of reality. Slowly the soul realises that Śiva's form is formlessness and thus unimaginable. Śiva is seen as the mysterious cause behind the universe. He is beyond the creator, protector or destroyer. Hence he can never be incarnated. He is fire in wood without burning it. He is the self in the body without being visible. He is in the universe like the sun's reflection in water. He remains unaffected. Eventually He is the transcendental existence. Like space 'meeting' space is the 'merger' of jīva into Śiva.

Thus we find that when after an endless cycle of material existence the soul searches a purpose and feels a mysterious Yakṣa guiding the universe, slowly the faith in the Yakṣa and desire to know it increases. Slowly 'I' is seen as different from the body, mind etc. 'I' is felt as the consciousness directing and controlling the body-mind complex. Similarly Śiva is felt as the controller of the universe. Since the body or a lost-limb can not be repaired by 'I', it must also be a creation of the universal consciousness. This brings the idea of 'I' dependent on Śiva. The independence enjoyed by 'I' using all the instruments and objects made by Śiva out of His own being makes him wonder at the mighty benign Śiva which slowly culminates in admiration, reverence and deep devotion with gratefulness. He feels

specially grateful to Him as Dakṣiṇāmūrti who bestows the wisdom of the Vedas. This wisdom expects him to be truthful, loving, calm and contented. The desire to be closer to Śiva increases. Slowly by dedicated devotion he is purified of passions, emotions and egoism. He is always willing to do good to others. All his actions are free of any expected rewards. All that he enjoys he considers as Śiva-nirmālya. Slowly ego dissolves and unity manifests. Self-surrender becomes complete. As we see the progress of devotion in Advaita we find that the attitude always remains of a servant, son or part of Śiva. The emphasis is never on emotionalism so prevalent in the Vaiṣṇava tradition, and which has often deteriorated into those by-lanes which lead to utter failure of the Divine spirit. Love is the response of the human heart to something that is wonderful. Beauty is one of the wonders of nature. Bhakti is actually trying to see the one who is wonderful or beautiful. Attachment to Śiva is the positive side which automatically leads to detachment from all that is not leading to Him. Exclusive love of course develops slowly. The Rudrādhyāya makes us see the all pervasive aspect of Śiva and feel an attraction in wonderment towards Him. But love must be directed to Him for the highest attainment rather than to His manifestations. An aspirant may think of Him with a form that the mind may grasp and the heart adore. He is all in all, the sole way, support, witness, abode, refuge, friend, source and goal. Śiva out of his grace reveals to him the nature of divine reality. He surrenders unconditionally. Motiveless love is all that he can offer. Thus the path is simple and straightforward for any aspirant in Advaita.

A person who has travelled this path addresses the Agni form of Śiva who is present in his mind. Fire is the form that the deity manifests as the first one on the path to Hiranyagarbha. Fire is also the final consumer of this physical body. Hence it is natural to remember it. Śaṅkara says that by reciting 'Aum', the supreme is remembered, for 'Aum' is His symbol. Giri points out that derived from a root meaning to protect, 'Aum' means the protector of all. Since the body-heat is its symbol it is recalled thus. The aspirant prays to the Lord to remember that he has dedicated all his life to Him. If any sins have been committed or any taint of bad impressions have remained, out of his infinite kindness, they should be wiped out so that he attains Him. Since we are unable to do anything more, we are only constantly offering ourselves to Him. By meditating on and surrendering to Śiva we become fit to pray for the revelation of His Supreme presence. Śiva knows all our deeds. To confess it is a way to assert that we are always in his presence. We act as if He is looking at us. He searches not words but the purity of our hearts. This feeling of complete dedication and one's incapacity, is the final step in devotion. This takes one to the vicinity of Śiva Himself.

THE SIXTH CHAPTER

In the previous chapter the worship of 'Aum' the control triad, worship of Brahman, and non-Brahman, its results, the route after death, worship of sun and prayers at the time of death have been described. Now mainly the worship of non-Brahman with its results and attainment of worldly results are going to be described. Some of the topics are covered in the Chhândogya Upaniṣad also. A question is bound to trouble an aspirant: Why is it that having dealt exhaustively with the highest knowledge and worship, the Upaniṣad ends with such trivial things? The Brahmasutra was conscious of it and one of the answers suggested was that even after the dawn of wisdom one must perform his duty, even of a householder. Thus a paramahansa's total renunciation is not justified. To assert this the Upaniṣad ends with such trivial ceremonies like naming and procreating. Thus the conclusion in activities of

householders is purposive. Śaṅkara answers that this is only to emphasise that one *can* attain knowledge in any station of life. Ānanda Giri summarises the whole discussion thus : Where the wise are seen to perform the activities, they are not performing due to any injunction, hence it can not be called action of the ignorant. They are bereft of any feeling of I-ness or my-ness which alone can be the *raison de tre* of an injunction. Thus that action is only "apparent." Their action is only for the protection of the world-order. Since householder's actions are the most needed for the maintainance of the world order, and also need most exertion including such acts like non-violence, sense control etc. it is proper that the final rounding up is done by praising it (गृहिणोपसंहारः, सू० ३.४.४८).

Gāyatri has been proclaimed as the vital force. But it has not been yet shown why is the vital force more important than other organs. It will also clarify the reason of the vital force being equated with uktha, sāma, yajuh, kṣatra etc., instead of equating them with other organs. Thus it starts as an appendix of the worship of prāṇa.

Prāṇa is the eldest and the greatest. Śaṅkara mentions a biological fact. Though chromosomes determining the formation of limbs, organs etc., are all in the semen and ovum, yet only the life force is functioning, or the manifest one. The eyes etc. are not yet manifest. But if semen or ova are not alive, the zygote will not even be formed. Neither will it develop further. Thus it is the eldest functioning element. Meditating thus one attains excellence in his group.

Speech is excellent, for the people who have the gift of speech become rich and live in splendour and they overcome others through their eloquence. One who meditates upon speech thus becomes excellent. The eye is the firm basis. Meditating thus one lives steadily in smooth places and times as also in difficult or inaccessible places and difficult times like famine. The ear is prosperity. Meditating thus one gets the objects that he desires. All the Vedas are acquired when one has the ear and through the Veda one knows the means of fulfilling his desires.

The mind is the abode of organs and objects. Objects become objects only when they are connected with the mind. Organs act only when goaded by the mind. Thus Śaṅkara points out an important Vedānta conception here : Objectness or organness are imposed by the mind on something pre-existing, but they can not be called objects or organs until the mind imposes it upon them. It is the interaction of an unknown element with the mind that is an object or an organ. Since it is unknown and will ever remain unknown it is nescience. Thus it is said that nescience is the material cause of objects.

Semen is procreation. Semen implies generative organs, since all the others in this context are also organs. Progeny and cattle wealth are the gains for one who meditates on it.

SUPREMACY OF VITALITY

The organs went to Brahman to find out who was the most excellent amongst them. Brahman said, "On whose departure the body becomes more impure than what it already is, should be the most excellent". Śaṅkara points out that the impurity of the body is due to its cause which is sin. Even though virtue is also included in the causes, the Upaniṣad is creating disgust towards it by such a statement. He also points out that even though Brāhman knew that vitality was the most excellent, he did not make the statement to avoid offence to others. That the teacher must never consciously say or act in a way that hurts the disciple in any way,

is the injunction. Hurt causes an obstacle in the mind of the disciple which obstructs observation of what is being taught. Education must also be purposive. It is meaningless to give information without giving a direction. Thus by calling the body a sin, the Veda is orienting the information towards a goal.

The speech, eye, ear, mind and semen all left one by one for a year but the person lived on. Then the vital air started going out. All others felt uprooted from the body and thus prayed to the Vital air not to leave. The Vital air asked for a tax which the others gave in the form of that which was their best quality. Śaṅkara points out that this story is only an imaginary way to teach a person how to test the greatness of any one. There are certain stories which may be true, but not this one for organs which are interdependent can not go separately out of the body for a year.

Vitality is the real eater of all foods. But this does not permit a person to eat prohibited food. After a lengthy discussion the great master points out that poison eaten by a poisonous worm is its nourishment, but will kill others. Similarly food eaten by a Brāhmaṇa body will harm it even though the same vital force is in that body which is in a pariah. Hence the prohibitions of food stand, in spite of the vital force being one. If even the oneness of the vital force does not bring identity of bodies, how can the oneness of Ātmā bring it, as many moderners try to suggest? Advaita teaches metaphysical identity of all that exists by cancelling their reality apart from the Reality itself which is the supreme Godhead. But within the empiric world we must act according to the adjuncts. By being conscious of it we will try to remove the lower adjuncts of a being and impose a higher adjunct. The empirical world demands the division of good and bad. This division makes all actions oriented towards goodness. What Advaita does suggest in the pragmatic sense is that since all beings are really Śiva, and since imposition of adjuncts makes us appear as they are, by changing the imposition it is possible to better all. This striving for the betterment of all will have no meaning if they are already so. Thus Advaita is a message of hope in the empiric world.

The Upaniṣad mentioned a particular meditation on the sipping of water prior and posterior to dining. Sipping has been prescribed in the Smṛtis. Thus only the meditation part is being ordained here. One must meditate that the water being sipped is the cloth for the vital breath. A great scientific truth is also suggested here. Life began in water and that is the thing that covers the life force. Water-less life is impossible. Thus by thinking of it we are made conscious that though food is apparently the cause of life, it is water which is really so. Even the assimilation of food in us depends on the water which extends the area of adsorption. Another important idea suggested here is that people should be clothed and housed as a matter of principle. In a society where people do not have these supplied in the normal course the sin of nakedness is attached to all the members of that society. In ancient India everyone was accommodated in a house, even though it may have been a thatched hut. So was everyone clothed. Urbanization in the industrial civilization has brought the conditions which have made society naked. Since a naked one is naturally unruly the whole society is suffering the consequences. Industrialisation starts with the concept of housing and clothing all, but ends up in making people naked. Through one act of sipping and another act of meditating the sipped water as a cover we get two results. The first purifies the diet and the second brings the consciousness of identity with prāṇa. Similarly all normal acts performed bring their normal results, but the meditation that they are a worship for the cosmic spirit, brings wisdom. Thus the whole life becomes a means for attaining wisdom.

PENTAD FIRE

In the last chapter the dying person prayed for the better path after death. This implies more than one paths. Those paths are now being explained. These paths are naturally connected with the results of one's deeds physical and mental. Hence they will also be described. Hence the meditation on five fires as means to the godly way is first being described. The same topic is dealt in the Chhândogya Upaniṣad. But here one extra fire of cremation has been mentioned. Yet it is not a different meditation as the learned editor has pointed out, because the sixth fire is a real fire, thus needing no injunction to see it as fire.

Śvetaketu, the grandson of Aruṇa studied under his father. To gain fame as a scholar he went to the parliament of the Pañchāla country. This country was called Krivi in the times of the Ṛgveda. It is to the north of the Gaṅga corresponding to Badāun, Farrukhabad etc. of today. The gangetic plain was always the most important region for philosophical and theological discussions. Śvetaketu went straight to king Pravāhaṇa, the son of Jivala. The king had heard of his pride and so addressed him in a way to show that he considered him a mere child. Śvetaketu got angry and addressed him in a way that a Brahman and not a Kṣatriya ought to be addressed. Thus the Veda is teaching us that pride must be eschewed when coming near the learned one. Humility is a great quality for a wise one. Arrogance and anger lead nowhere.

The king asked him about the divergence of ways after death, their return, the reason for the heaven not being overpopulated, how many oblations lead to man, the way of gods and manes etc. But Śvetaketu could not answer a single question. Thus his pride melted away. The king then seeing him humbled addressed him in a proper way and asked the offerings to be given due to a Brāhmaṇa, but out of shame he did not accept these and the invitation to stay. Instead he hurriedly went back to his father.

Thus the Upaniṣad makes it clear that it was not high learning alone that brought honour to a Brāhmaṇa. He was to be honoured because of his birth. As long as Śvetaketu was arrogant he was slighted by the king. But when he left arrogance, the king showed due honour. Thus the paurāṇika injunction that a Brāhmaṇa whether learned or not must be honoured, has Vaidika basis.

Śvetaketu complained to his father that he was questioned by that 'mean' king on subjects that were not known to him. The father was humble enough to admit his own ignorance and wanted that both of them should go to the king to learn these secrets. But Śvetaketu was full of anger and refused to accompany him. Śaṅkara points out that he did not want to see that face again. The father went alone. Pravāhaṇa on seeing him offered a seat, water, madhuparka etc. as are due to an honourable Brāhmaṇa. Having worshipped him thus he asked Āruṇi Gautama to ask for any present. He asked the answers to the questions he had asked his son as the present. The king said that he should ask some physical objects as present and not knowledge of secret doctrines. Gautama Āruṇi said "I already possess gold, cows, horses, servants etc. Hence worldly wealth is not needed by me. Give me the inexhaustible and infinite wealth of wisdom". The king asked him to approach in a proper way of a disciple. Gautama made the declaration that he was his disciple. Śaṅkara points out that when a man of a higher caste approaches a person of a lower caste for instructions he should not touch his feet or serve him. Merely a vocal declaration of discipleship is enough. Thus the scriptures have allowed the lower caste to teach the upper caste when a proper upper

caste man is not available to teach a subject. In modern times it is quite important, for often the knowledge is possessed by the lower castes. But it should not be made an occasion by the teacher to get the kind of worship due to a Brāhmaṇa. Giri makes a declaration that becoming a disciple of a lower caste is better than being bereft of knowledge.

In spite of the knowledge the king was humble enough to beg pardon for having asked him to declare his discipleship reminding that this is an ancient tradition. No knowledge can be hidden from one who comes as a fit disciple. This is a rule which must be remembered. In a passion not to teach an unfit person, people withhold it even from a fit person. This withholding also is a sin. The king is clear that this knowledge was entirely restricted to Kṣatriyas and as such he is bound to maintain the tradition that it should not be imparted to a non-Kṣatriya. But equally he must keep his promise. Thus imparting a knowledge to a worthy disciple takes precedence over the tradition of maintaining it within a certain group.

Heaven, cloud, this world, man, woman and pyre are the fires. Śaṅkara discusses in detail how the agnihotra in all its organs remains in a divine way until the fruits are reaped by the performer. He further clears that though only Agnihotra is mentioned as such, all the Vedic actions are meant to be included. Giri makes clear that no birth of any kind is possible without its being the result of past actions, for how can joy and suffering come into being without an act which has been committed.

Śaṅkara points out that night darkness is really the earth-shadow. Giri identifies it with Rāhu. He also points out that Soma is the residence and chandramā is the resident.

This meditation leads householders to the nothern path. Monks anchorites and committed celibates go to the nothern path independently. They reach this by meditating with faith on truth-Brahman in a quiet place bereft of worldly crowds. The editor has given the gist of Madhusūdana Sarasvatī's comments as well as the view of the Brahmasūtras on this issue. Śaṅkara quotes from the Viṣṇu purāṇa that eighty eight thousand celibates attained immortality. Householders attain the nothern route by realising themselves to be of the nature of fire, and they attain the same by their celibacy. Giri points out that by monks here are meant the Vaiṣṇavas who have three daṇḍas. Paramahansa given to knowledge are not to travel the path of gods. Or if there are any one-daṇḍas sticking only to the observance of āśrama rules and not given to Upanisad's study, they also may attain to this path. Śaṅkara points out that fire, flame, day etc. are words denoting the specific deities and not flame or day etc. Monks bereft of all sacrifice can have no connection with flame. Death occurs the moment the term of life ends. None can make a rule that such and such a meditator should die only at such and such a time. Even the wait until day of those who die at night to reach heaven, is out of question, for the Veda states that he reaches the sun as quickly as the glance of the mind. Thus all these refer to the deities who are stationed between the earth and the Brahmaloka. The editor proves quoting from the Brahmasūtra that Brahman here means the conditioned Brahman. The plural in Brahmaloka is to mention the different parts of the plane with varied enjoyments according to the depth and types of meditations. The Purāṇas call these different parts as Goloka, Vaiṣṇavaloka, Maṇidvīpa Śāketaloka, Kailāsaloka etc. Those who reach there do not come back to earth they stay there for a long time and return after the present cycle. It is in this sense that the eternity of Brahmaloka or non-return has been often said in the Veda, Smṛti, Purāṇas and Itihāsas.

The southern path is described as the one attained by ritual worship, charity and austerity. The plural in loka here also means different regions having varieties of joys. Smoke, night etc. are the deities and not physical objects. Gods enjoy these worshippers and also bestow joys on them. Many concepts of heaven, which are often called salvation, are of this nature. God is supposed to enjoy the souls while bestowing joy to them. Such concepts refer not to the northern route but to the southern one. Once the matter that became their body melts at the end of the exhaustion of their virtuous deeds they become like ether. Slowly they descend to the human sphere. The cycle goes on until liberation.

Those who neither meditate nor worship become insects etc. The idea is they cause nothing but pain to others. All virtue is centered in doing good to others. Those who do not perform virtuous acts here continue in the stream of viciousness.

Life thus is not a formless flow, but has a pattern which is not exhausted by the brief span of human life. Death is not a total cessation. The future may either be a temporal duration or immortality. Immortality is a higher existence transcending past and future, which may even be attained while alive. Perpetuity is temporal and hence ethical. At this level there is infinite progress. Ethics demand infinite time to work out infinite perfection. According to this scheme there is future involving a continuous process of moral purification and an ever increasing identification of the human will with the Divine.

The body is the basis and starting point for the development of life, mind and spirit. Bodiless beings are not known. Thus the Upaniṣad endorses souls with body even in an after-life to emphasise the importance of development. Death is thus a condition of life, not its denial. Karma and devotion both are useful. Devotion is mainly the determination to be on the side of Śiva. One who has it gets a taste only for such actions as are good. The doctrine of Karma teaches us to be patient and persisting in our ethical betterment. Those deformed in body and mind, weak in will and reason should not be condemned for they have a rising future. Realisation that one can not defy one's destiny makes one despair. But belief in Karma gives one hope. Since we are the result of our doings, we can certainly better our lot, the future is not a finished product like the past. Our experience includes an integral record. A new situation brings forth the result out of this integral development to the fore to interpret it. This resultant is the tendency (saṁskāra) which persists though memories are crowded out by new experiences. 'Wisdom', says Rādhākṛṣṇan, 'does not consist in vast stores of knowledge, but in the ability to profit by experience'. Death does not wipe out the tendencies. This is what is called vijñāna (विज्ञान) which is equated with determinate consciousness due to vāsanā, vidyā, karma and pūrva-prajñā. (Brahma Sutra 3.1.1). The subtle elements forming the basis of the body are carried by the dying soul with himself. It is of the shape of a thumb. Thus a body of some form is always associated with the soul and material karma remains associated with it. Vedānta postulates an ocatad (अष्टादश) that accompanies the soul at death. It includes the five vital airs, five senses of perception, five senses of action, five elements, four inner organs, desires, results of action and meditation, and ignorance.

RITUALS

Śaṅkara points out that virtuous activities depend upon wealth. Wealth must be acquired in an ethical way. The Upaniṣad lays down the method for it. Thus it lays down

that wealth acquired through incorrect means is not proper to be utilised for virtuous actions. Following this doctrine in pre-independence India religious people avoided using tainted wealth for a religious cause. But post-independence India gives a completely contrary picture. Ill-gotten wealth is practically the only wealth utilised for charity and religious purposes. The result of such acts can be clearly observed as not getting peace for the performer of those charities and worship. Though it may sound impractical, the health of Hindu society may benefit a lot if the *quantity* of charity be replaced by the *quality* of wealth. Those who discuss the inferiority of worship for worldly gains (Kāmya-Karma) are as a rule quite oblivious of their unethical inferiority in worldly activities. It is better to prosper through worship than through unethical practices.

Śaṅkara points out that the ritual will give greatness, and greatness will bestow wealth. Thus it is clear that the wealth comes out of worldly exertion. The worship only endows power to a person to exert in a way that brings wealth. Hence the ritual is not a magical formula to produce wealth out of nothing. The ceremony described here is one mentioned in the Smṛti. Thus it is not a Vaidika ordination. The offerings are to the all pervading spirit and specially to the vital point described in the earlier section of this chapter remembering the specific qualities of ears, eyes, mind etc. Then heaven etc., Brahman etc., past etc. are included. It is vital force identified as Brahman that is the object of worship. Thus the idea is that one who looks upon his elan vital as divine goes through successful ethical gains in the world. The last prayer is Madhumatī mixed with gāyatrī followed by recalling the tradition. This mixing of incantation is the origin of saṃpuṭa, pallawa etc. type of recitation in which a mantra is repeated twice or once in the middle of a text. Rudra nāmaka-chamaka repetition is also a method in this line. The idea is that repetition of a prayer brings about the result associated with that prayer quicker if associated with a general prayer.

Uddālaka Āruṇī gave the knowledge of this rite to Yājñavalkya and so on. What to speak of a human being, even a dry stump if sprinkled with this powerful paste, will become great by growing branches and leaves. But it must be taught only to a disciple or a son. Gīri points out six persons entitled to be students. Disciple, learned in the Veda, intelligent, giver of wealth, son and who can teach some other branch of knowledge. Out of these six only two should be taught this worship. The list of vessels and materials round up the ceremony. The paste contains clear mention of lentil (मसूर). This paste is to be eaten. Thus common belief of some people that it is not a grain that is allowed, is un-Vaidika. Specially because Śaṅkara specifies that other grains which are not prohibited can also be utilised. Thus the list can not contain a prohibited grain.

The next section takes up the ritual for procreating a desired son. This is necessary both for this world and the next one. A son continuing the tradition of the father and expanding it along those lines is an asset in this world. In his advanced age, a father is freed from responsibilities and can dedicate himself to a higher ideal. After the death the son performs the last rites and Śrāddha etc. which help the father rise to a higher state. Actually every human being wants his words and ideals to become immortal. This immortality can be assured only by a well mannered son. Specially in a society given to caste system, as Hindu society has been through millenia, the ideal of a son is much more important. Then the Upaniṣad wants to emphasise the fact that in the earlier age every wise one begot another wise

one for the fulfilment of Veda's announcement that in the lineage of a wise one none will remain ignorant of the wisdom. Even in the last section a son was regarded the proper recipient of the knowledge. That is possible only if he has such a tendency. Thus the rite of procreation is directly needed for this declaration of the Upaniṣad. Moreover a person worshipping prāṇa as the all consummating power as told in the previous section, should perform the procreation ceremony after having performed the one associated with wealth in the preceding sections. This is important, for begetting a son without proper wealth to bring him up and educate properly is not the idea of the Vaidika culture. One must not produce children without proper arrangements for their well being.

Semen is said to be the most potent form of all the physical and vegetable world. The Ṛgveda calls it the emanating light. Brahman created woman as its abode. She is thus the recipient of the most excellent creation in the universe. Manu says that woman should be worshipped appropriately for gods to stay in a house. The Monk renounces the woman and thus has no relation with gods. Thus the Purāṇas say that abandoning the woman one abandons the whole universe. No ritual is performable by a widower. Thus the Brahama Sūtra has a special section for the widower who desires wisdom. This important status of woman is an important Vaidika conception which is often lost sight of in post Mohammadan India for with the association of Islāma, Hinduism started regarding woman as of a lower nature.

Brahman worshipped her while she was kept below, and he was above. This worship through sex must be done with as much intensity, faith and carefulness as any sacrifice. Here it is pointed out that this is Vājpeya sacrifice. Giri points out that good persons follow the least of the best. Since Brahman is the best to be followed, good people must not indulge in sex casually or for mere form or relaxation. It must be always attended to according to the dictates of the scriptures. Thus Śāṅkara points out that one must wait for the menstrual flow to occur before even thinking of procreating.

No injunction is needed for this act as even animals indulge in it. But just as eating according to scriptures leads to proper results, so also this act when done with proper vision or meditation. In a sacrifice there is a hard stone to squeeze the juice of the soma vine. It is to be moved with great strength and intensity to squeeze the juice. Because of the similarity of hardness etc. the generative organ is to be seen as the stone. Brahman stretched it in a way that the female could be completely filled. Thus there was complete amalgamation of the two. The female generative organ is the place for sacrificial fire (vedi). Her pubic hair is the kuśa grass scattered around the sacrificial fire. The loose skin is that contrivance of leather, like a hand press that extracts and strains the juice when the soma is pressed. The sides or the labia are like testicles and are hard mussels, that by which the extraction takes place. It is biologically important for there must be similarity with the testicles physiologically and psychologically. The idea is that the side skin of the generative organ be meditated as the skin of ox used for thrashing and repeating the soma which is made clear by Giri. The same result that a sacrificer of Vājpeya gains is gained by a person who copulates performing this meditation. Śāṅkara says by this proclamation the Veda clearly states that one must not abhor or detest this ceremony which is for the good of the race. Thus it is praised. The one who worships with the lower posture chooses the good deeds of the women. That is, he dictates the norms of life in a household. But if ignorant of this identification with Vājpeya, indulges in losing the Retas, because of this evil indulgence the woman controls him or chooses the

good as norms for the household. The idea is that this brings about a total change in the ideals of a house. One can easily trace the loss of parental tradition in modern Indian families to such indulgence. Some have interpreted that the good deed of a woman are turned to man if he is a wise one. The idea is that he will get the rewards of the virtues committed by the women. This interpretation has given rise to a commonly held belief that the virtuous deeds of a woman are transferred to some extent to her husband. The ignorant one's virtuous deeds are transferred to the women. Thus the animal act is changed into a ritual performance with the proper identification of parts of the body. Many Brāhmaṇas in the course of the cycle of birth and death die as bereft of senses, meritless for they practise without knowledge the act of creation. This has been proclaimed by such great Brahmajñānī Ṛṣis as Uddālaka Āruṇi, Nāka Maudgalya and Kumāra Hārīta. They all were endowed with this knowledge. A Brāhmaṇa who does not know this meditation is called Brahmaṇya i. e. only related to Brāhmaṇas and thus making a living merely out of his being a Brāhmaṇa by birth. Thus all Brāhmaṇas are ordained to learn this. Such people having no control become indulgent and attached to the mere physical aspect of joy and thus become weak in organs and bereft of any good deeds. Thus Śaṅkara makes clear that this is also for renouncing the indulgence in material joys. And it is obvious that such attachment leads to physical and moral degeneration. Śaṅkara points out that ordinarily the sexual act is extremely simple and makes an otherwise virtuous person lose heaven. Thus the view of some students of the Upaniṣads that sex is eulogised is misplaced. It remains condemned, and the Upaniṣad in no way is a help to those moderners who want to make this an opening to higher spiritual life. Only the biological necessity is accepted and this necessity is changed into a ritual for avoidig over indulgence.

If while waiting for the woman's cycle and practising celibacy there is a discharge due to intense passion either in dreams or waking, no matter how small or large a discharge, the following penance must be performed. This is a clear indication that the rite is for the first few children in the prime youth and health. The penance is to repeat a special incantation while rubbing the semen with the ring finger and thumb. The incantation means that the semen of mine which is spilled due to intense attachment either on ground or vegetation or its cause water, that semen may be brought back to me and with it the senses, beauty, goodluck, knowledge, etc. May the lord fire who is the abode of gods bring these back to me. Let the fire and alter of sacrifice regain their vitality. One should rub it on the middle part of his eyebrows or chest. Similarly if one sees ones shadow in water one must always pray. The reason is that water is the cause of semen. The prayer is that gods may give me back my lustre, vigour, fame, wealth and merit.

The excellence of woman is when she is out of her menstrual period indicated by the removal of dirty clothes. Hence after the three nights are over and she has washed her hair she should be requested to cooperate in the generation of a son. She should be presented with ornaments etc., if she is not willing, to please her. Giri points out that one's extreme love for her is proclaimed by such presents. When she agrees he should bless her that with his organ and glory he blesses her with glory. Both become glorious. The idea is that the desire of both is necessary to have a glorious son. If she totally refuses she loses the glory of becoming the mother of a glorious son, since he may force her by manly power including thrashing. But though she will have to go through the child bearing she will not beget a glorious son. Or a son thus born out of force will have the impression of one who was

unwanted by the mother. Thus he will not be faithful and obedient to the mother. This idea is important for many children in the modern world are born as unwanted ones. Child delinquency is an off shoot of this parental feeling. The child must be born out of love of both the parents.

When the woman gets menstrual flow she should drink only out of a cup and wear unwashed clothes. She should not touch a śūdra or śūdrī whether bathed or not. At the end of the three nights she should wash her hair (take bath with the plunge of head in a tank or a river) and wear clean clothes. She should then be made to thrash rice. The couple should eat the things that are going to be prescribed cooked out of only this rice for the respective kind of son or daughter. A fair son who learns the Veda and lives for a hundred years is born to those who partake rice cooked in milk and eaten with ghee. Gīri points out that fair may be either in colour or character. Curd-cooked rice taken with ghee produces a tawny or brown coloured son or the one who masters sāṅkhya or chanda śāstra, studies two Vedas and lives a full life. Rice merely cooked in water and taken with ghee produces a red eyed dark son who studies three Vedas and lives a full measure. Dark may also refer to an immoral character and red eyes to anger. The idea is that one who wants a greater scholar whether he has character or not should take up this means. A scholarly daughter is born if rice cooked with sesamum is taken with ghee. Scholarship here does not refer to the Veda for daughters are not entitled to Vaidika knowledge. But they may master other branches of knowledge. It seems to us that the word paṇḍitā may suggest spiritual wisdom. If one desires a scholar famous, delightful orator, winner in an assembly one should take meatpūlao with meat preferably of a young or mature ox. Thus it is clear that the food taken at the time of conception has an important bearing on the kind of son that is born. Of course one must scientifically realise these truths. But the main trend of the Upaniṣad is clear.

Next morning he makes ghee offering to the deities Fire, Anumati, Sun and begetter of truth. Then he eats prasāda and gives it to his wife also. After washing his hands he sprinkles the woman thrice with the consecrated water. He prays to Vishvāvasū, the gandharva presiding passion to leave this place and enter another couple. The idea is that one should have no intercourse after this ceremony until the birth of the child. This is both a biological necessity and a psychological must. After this he embraces the woman saying, 'I am vital breath and you are speech. I am Sāmaveda and you are Ṛgveda. I am heaven and you are earth. Let us start shining together and use our vigour to have the proper child.' The prayer is important for it contains the real reason why man should be above the woman Man is basically heaven i. e. looking upwards meaning idealist, and woman earthly or practical. Similarly she is the Ṛgveda which supplies the basis for weaving the Sāmaveda. Similarly woman by keeping the household and family, supplies the basis for man's adventure in the outside world. He is vigour and she is speech which is mild and sweet. It is the speech which gives credit to man's exploits. Thus woman is the basis and not *low* as suggested by some uvaidika thinkers.

After this he spreads the thighs apart meditating that he is separating heaven and earth. Having entered and kissed he strokes her from the head, downwards thrice along the hair praying "Let Viṣṇu prepare the womb for conception, Tvaṣṭā (sun) make the organs beautiful; may the Virāṭ enter me and pour semen into you. Sūtrātmā may enter you and nourish and develop the conceived child. Siniwālī, the presiding deity of the dark night who

is highly praised in the world, may enter you and hold the child. Let the ones who are decorated with their garlands of rays i. e. sun and moon enter you and develop properly." Entering here means identifying, i. e. a woman should meditate that the respective gods are responsible for these acts. This shows naturally a woman fit to understand and meditate. The Tantras hold that the woman for rituals must be an initiated one. Viṣṇu, Sun, Moon, Brahmā (Antaryāmi) are all important deities and have been explained in the present Upaniṣad. The psychological state of the couple at the time of conception is important according to the Vaidika tradition. The feeling of complete dedication means that even such acts are controlled by Divine powers and we must only take refuge in God and feel ourselves as mentally the vehicles of these powers to help the great unknown design of Śaṅkara. Gods are the primary cause of generation while the parents are only the concomitant cause. Then after the emission he prays to Aśvinīs to churn the zygote with the golden rods. Gīri points out that heat or fire is the churning rods. This is a great biological truth. The metabolic process of the mother's body is responsible and Aśvinīs being the deities of the nostrils, the Veda postulates that the type of air that is drawn in is also responsible for the child. Thus oxygen intake is quite important. Exertion that causes the purification of blood through the lungs is quite necessary. The Veda does not encourage too much rest for the would be mother. Fragrance and the connected mental vāsanā is also important. The mother after conception must consciously keep away the thoughts which are not agreeable. "Just as fire impregnates earth, sun the sky and air the directions, so I impregnate you" (after which the name of the wife is to be uttered). The idea is that by the act of giving birth the relationship between a husband and wife becomes that of complete unity. The husband pervades and the wife is pervaded.

Some other ceremonies connected with the couple are also given, for this being an appendix has to cover all miscellaneous topics. If a person wants his wife to be entirely devoted to him, he after entering and kissing, rubbing her genitals should recite: "You are born from every limb and come out of the heart. Being the essence of my whole being make her devoted (or loving) to me like a deer pierced by a poisoned arrow." The idea is that a prayer in the act of meeting brings about the desired result. The deity here is vigour. Thus it is manly vigour of his whole physical and psychological being that will make a woman attracted. Thus the Veda wants to emphasise that under all conditions a man should keep himself vigilant. A paramour, can be harmed by a sacrifice which is laid down. Putting āvasathya fire in an unbaked earthen vessel, spreading the reed arrows in reverse (than usual), sprinkling with ghee the reeds should be offered. The incantation is "In my fire (woman) which, was kindled by youth, beauty etc. you have offered the offering (semen). Because of this sinning I (repeat the name) take away your (repeat the name) life force (prāṇa and apāna). Similarly I take away your sons and wealth, virtue gained by your śrauta and smārta action, hope and expectation. 'Phat' must be repeated at the end of each offering". The paramour dies losing his organs and merits due to the curse of the wise. Hence a person given to the meditation of prāṇa as Brahman and knowing this ritual must be feared. One should not desire to cohabit the wife of a wise one, for such a learned one is able to destroy him.

BIRTH CEREMONY

At the time of delivery the woman should be sprinkled with water uttering "like the wind moves a pond without destroying the pond, the foetus should totally move without

destroying the generative organ. May the chorion come out with it. Lord has made this the path of Indra (the Prāṇa) coming into the universe. Lord again has put the covering like a bottled fence to keep the soul of the mother and the child separate, Oh Indra, having come in that path come out with the foetus and bring the muscle (fence) along." This prayer is for a successful delivery. The babe is the Lord himself. Indra has taken infinite forms, says the Veda. Thus even at the time of birth the baby is reminded its reality. The birth is the process made by God for rejuvenation of life. It must not disturb or destroy the passage. Birth is a natural process. The Veda does not like to disturb it like the modern gynaecologists. The close association of the husband at the time of delivery is a Vaidika concept, finding some support in the modern western world where they have started insisting lately the presence and involvement of the husband in the act of delivery. The impersonal nature of delivery is bound to bring an impersonal nature in the child.

After the birth the sacrificial fire is made ready. The new born babe is taken in the lap. Curd and ghee is mixed in a bronze cup. At the spot of sacrifice a thousand oblations are offered with this mixture. The mantra is "Having flourished in the shape of this son may I nourish a thousand people. May not my son who is in the conch, lose the continuity of this lineage, wealth, cattle etc." The idea is they should never get exhausted. "Mentally I offer my vitality to you. The Lord of fire knows all my shortcomings and overdoings. May He correct all these." The idea here is the longevity and good tidings for the child coupled with the idea that one must nourish the society more and more, since with the birth of a child good society in future has become necessary for me. The Veda always sees social good in terms of the individual good. This is the proper psychological attitude. Else the motivation for social good dies out.

After this, taking the newborn babe near and putting ones mouth near his right ear "speech" should be recited thrice. The idea as pointed out by Giri is that may Veda in the form of prose, poetry and song be attained by you. Then he mixes curd, honey and ghee and feeds the child with a golden strip which must not be obstructed by anything in the mouth. The mantra is "I bestow earth, sky, heaven, all of these on you". Milk has been proclaimed earlier as an animal food. Hence the first food should *not* be milk. Gold is a religious symbol for the Hindus, it symbolises purity and knowledge. The father prays for prosperity of the child. Then the father gives him the name 'Veda'. This is his secret name. Giri points out that Veda means experience which is every ones own real form. All these ceremonies are dealt in detail in Pāraskara-gr̥hya-sūtra, Āśvalāyana-gr̥hya-sūtra, Śāṅkhyāyana-gr̥hya-sūtra, Gobhilagr̥hya sūtra, Manu-smṛti etc. Having purified the child in his lap he presents him to the mother and gives him her breast uttering: 'Oh Saraswati, your breast is unfailing and refreshing, wealthy, abundant, generous. You nourish all worthy beings. Bestow this woman with all this for the baby to suck from.' The mother is identified with the goddess of learning. It is said Śāṅkara, Jñānasambandhara etc. were fed by the Divine mother, and they attained all the knowledge.

At the end of the ceremony he addresses the mother. She is Ilā in the lineage of Mitrā-Varaṇa. Giri points out the meaning of Ilā as the one who is praise-worthy or adorable. He also points out that actually she is the wife of the son of Mitrāvaraṇa who is none other than Vasiṣṭha. Thus she is Arundhatī. At the marriage ceremony the wife is shown the star Arundhatī. Thus it is natural to point out that now she herself

has achieved the status of Arundhatī. She is a heroine who has given birth to a son through me who am myself a hero. The statement is important for it seems in the Vaidika tradition all the twice born were supposed to be heroes. 'May you have many long-living sons, for you have made me the father of a heroic son.' A son born with all these rituals is said to be an excellent heir, because he excels in prosperity, fame and Brahma-knowledge-radiance like his father, grandfather etc. This is the praise of the father also.

Thus ends the ritualistic section. Procreation is an act where the human soul acts as the Divine Father himself. Thus the Upaniṣad ends in the tone that a person should behave as if he was as responsible for the universe as God Himself, after realisation. It is not an injunction for the wise, but just a statement of fact.

The Upaniṣad ends with the list of the teachers' lineage, which is, as Śaṅkara pointed out, maternal. That is to emphasise the fact that it is the mother who being purified with sprinkling, stroking etc. procreates the son. Her importance is indicated. Moreover the mother's training is crucial for the child's training. It is made clear by Śaṅkara that the Śukla-yaju is so called because the Brāhmaṇa portion and Mantra portion is not mixed up as in the Kṛṣṇa yaju. The Vedas are pure for they are not human creation, nor is their knowledge available anywhere else. All knowledge flowing from Brahma has been divided amongst human beings. Vaidika knowledge is eternal. The Veda concludes with salutation to Brahman and to those who have followed him to this day.

CONCLUSION

As we complete the review of this majestic and beautiful text, a question may be asked about its utility in the present scientific world. It may represent heights of speculation in a dim past, but of what use it is to a modern man. This question must be answered in an intelligent way. It must not merely emotionally be handled by an appeal to the faithful to uphold the skeleton of Indian or Hindu culture. The fact is that religion is as much a part of life in the modern world as at any past moment in history, and shall remain thus as long as human beings are going to be moved by values which are spiritual in nature. Thus scientific religion may be at the moment displacing dogmatic religion, but it is religion all the same. Human knowledge and experience includes religion. Thus an integral study of humanity will have to include a scientific approach to religion. As Hindus we have a great contribution to make to this science of religion. It was Hinduism which first proclaimed the impersonal religion of an impersonal God. It was in the present Upaniṣad that the clarion call was given to rationally and logically analyse the revealed truth and integrate it with total human experience. All revealed truth must be made living. The prophet of this Upaniṣad Yājñavalkya was perhaps intuned more with the scientific spirit than any physicist today. Like Einstein denying the teachings of Newton, Yājñavalkya took a stand against Vaishampāyana. Hence to a Hindu, modern science is not a modern phenomenon. The prophetic and dogmatic religions may be afraid of it, but not Vedānta.

It is true that the impact of a scientific view of life has been more pervasive and revolutionary in modern times, for it has touched every corner of human experience and existence. Passion for truth, critical investigation and free enquiry forms the tripod of values on which the whole structure of science stands. These have helped to advance humanity in

all fields and in turn moulded man, his environment and values. Yājñavalkya's passion for truth is visible in the text. His discussions are models of free enquiry and critical investigation. Of course he adds the fourth dimension to it as the respect for ancient knowledge inherited by us. I presume, science is quite conscious of it as depicted by their history. Only they refuse to admit it as a *criterion* of truth. Yājñavalkya will suggest that when experience, reason, logic etc. are all equally on both sides, we may admit the older knowledge as the valid one. Practically science does the same thing by sticking to the prevalent theory or model unless it becomes necessary to discard it.

A Hindu cultivated this passion of truth advancing his knowledge in the fields of semantics, grammar, mathematics, psychology, philosophy, mysticism, religion, astronomy, chemistry, physics, biology, health, society etc. But after the fall of the Hindu culture at the hands of barbarians in the thirteenth century, this light went out and darkness set in and continued for over six centuries. But even in this period the light of religion went on flickering. At times it was up and tended with rare courage by mystics whose scientific approach forms one of the majestic structures of human culture. The Bhakti movement both in its Nirguṇa and Saguna aspects is based on the researches of these mystics. They were with the passion for truth able to go deep into the very heart of two antagonised cultures, Hindu and Mohammedan, and form a foundation that was going to be the greatest asset of the middle ages. Their attempt was thwarted by the organised church of both the cultures, but much more so by the Mohammedan one, for Hindu scientific spirit could never die. Organised religion gets entangled in vested interests and wants to stick to the formalism of finished and final dogmas. It is unable to renounce the wealth and power in society. Yājñavalkya is clear that the passion for truth will eventually come into conflict with this organised religion and the aspirant will have to break the shackles and become a monk. Love of truth has an enemy in the other three pursuits (वृत्तयः). But the Hindu atmosphere did not bring the monk to torture and death as the Christian and Mohammadan atmosphere did.

The eighteenth century brought new wind from Europe which was carrying a fresh aroma of freedom after a millenium of suffocation in the dark ages. The Greek culture, an associate of the Indian culture, had broken the shackles, and modern scientific culture was on the march. Facts were being substituted in place of opinions. They had started the study of the book of nature in place of that by an author. It needs a mind that seeks facts, questions them with seriousness of purpose, tests and verifies the answers. Religion was kept out of this enquiry for an organised church could not stand being questioned. Thus the western society was intellectually a divided camp. It was science versus religion, reason versus faith etc. This was the historic situation when Europe met India. Modern science found its mate in Hinduism that did not have a dogma to believe in, but a method and a means to unveil the meaning and mystery of existence. R. E. Hume says "The earnestness of the search for truth is one of the delightful and commendable features of the Upaniṣads". The Upaniṣads are an intelligent records of spiritual experiences. These findings have been verified throughout the ages to our own day. Discoveries of physical sciences have only revealed their rational basis. Thus religion and science became a team in the search of truth. No one can deny that deep within all of us we feel a 'within'. Its search is religion. This is the Ātmā of the Upaniṣad. The 'without' is Brahma. The integration of the two is Advaita philosophy. Both should be known in an integrated way says Vāsudeva Kṛṣṇa, the knowledge of object

(without) and subject (within) is wisdom (क्षेत्रक्षेत्रज्ञयोर्ज्ञानं यत्तज्ज्ञानम्). Both are one says 'Aham Brahma Asmi'.

Thus the Indian contact showed the west a path of reconciliation. Science was humbled. Religion was enriched. Unfortunately the Indians trained in western sciences were ignorant of this inheritance of theirs, and religious orthodoxy of Hinduism was steeped in superstitious aspects. Thus India in spite of making its contribution to the world culture remains itself a divided house. Its rulers, economists, politicians, scientists are relying heavily only on the models of the west which are already over-dated. The only remedy is in exposing the youth of our nation to the truths and methodology of the Upaniṣads along with the intellectual foundations laid by Śaṅkara and others of his school. In Śaṅkara we find the practice of a religious quest in a ceaseless way until it finds the God within, which is infinite existence, consciousness and bliss (सच्चिदानन्द). En-route at the intermediate stations, it realises all the higher ethical values. The modern science of the third quarter of the twentieth century has come to a point of realisation where the physical points to a mystery beyond itself. Physics has led us ultimately to an abyss which it is impossible to span. The reason is that man himself is chained by his finite being. Niels Bohr says "We are both spectators and actors in the great drama of existence". Without understanding himself he can not understand the vast veiled universe. Unless the mystery of transcending himself by perceiving himself in the act of perception is unveiled, the mystery will remain unsolved. Yājñavalkya and Śaṅkara help us to unveil this mystery. The ignorance is rooted in consciousness and must be handled there. Śaṅkara makes us realise the infinite dimensions of our finite personality. Ignorant Śiva is man, enlightened man is Śiva. Śaṅkara gives us the most rational science of religion which transcends the bounds of cultures of different religions. He has provided terms models and concepts which can explain all the varieties of religious experience. Its knowledge along with the scientific knowledge of physical objects will constitute the complete education of man. To quote R. A. Millikan, the astro-physicist : "It seems to me that the two great pillars upon which all human well-being and human progress rest are first, the spirit of religion, and second the spirit of science or knowledge. Neither can attain its largest effectiveness without support from the other. To promote the latter, we have universities and research institutions. But the supreme opportunity for everyone with no exception lies in the first".

And this is precisely the utility of the present publication. The Bṛahadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad is specially suited for this because it presents the most exhaustive and comprehensive science of religion in human history. It touches the sky-heights where the wisest tremble to walk, it also has large plains where the wise enjoy a promenade, it touches the very roots of religion where magic and mysticism merge into one. May the study of this revelation bring peace to humanity.

Kārtika Śuklā Pratipadā, 2042.

Abu Mount.

Svāmī Maheśānanda Giri

Mahāmandeleśvara